

THE EMANCIPATION OF LABOR

A History of the First International

Henryk Katz

Contributions in Labor Studies Number 36



Greenwood Press
New York · Westport, Connecticut · London

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Katz, Henryk.

The emancipation of labor : a history of the first international /
Henryk Katz.

p. cm.—(Contributions in labor studies, ISSN 0886-8239 ;
no. 36)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0-313-27447-9

1. International Workingmen's Association. 2. Labor movement—
History—19th century. 3. Communism—History—19th century.

I. Title. II. Series.

HX11.L46K38 1992

324.1'7—dc20 90-22395

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data is available.

Copyright © 1992 by Barbara D. Katz

All rights reserved. No portion of this book may be
reproduced, by any process or technique, without the
express written consent of the publisher.

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number: 90-22395

ISBN: 0-313-27447-9

ISSN: 0886-8239

First published in 1992

Greenwood Press, 88 Post Road West, Westport, CT 06881

An imprint of Greenwood Publishing Group, Inc.

Printed in the United States of America



The paper used in this book complies with the
Permanent Paper Standard issued by the National
Information Standards Organization (Z39.48-1984).

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

*To Barbara,
my wife and companion*

Contents

<i>Acknowledgments</i>	ix
<i>Introduction</i>	xi
1 The Foundation	1
2 Metamorphoses	20
3 Encounters: Lausanne and Brussels	31
4 The High Tide	41
5 Bakunin in the International	51
6 War and Revolution	69
7 London 1871	82
8 The "Latin" Rebellion	96
9 The Northern Bastions	115
10 The Fulfillment	128
<i>Notes</i>	145
<i>Bibliography</i>	161
<i>Index</i>	173

Acknowledgments

I express my warm thanks to all the librarians and archivists in the various places and countries where I found riches of materials for the study and conception of my theme. In the first place, I thank the academic and technical staff of the International Institute for Social History in Amsterdam, who helped with valuable advice and access to their inexhaustible resources. I thank the Nuffield Foundation and the, regrettably extinct, Social Sciences Research Council, who helped me with funds for my wide travels.

I am greatly indebted for the literary revision of my text to two of my colleagues and friends, Rita Furley and Anne Godrich. I also thank my publishers for their valuable advice and labor in bringing my book to fruition. It goes without saying that the remaining faults and blemishes, hopefully small, are my own.

Introduction

Beginning in 1859, ten years after the defeat of the great European revolution of 1848–1849, the world was engulfed by a new process of revolutionary change. This change was more extensive geographically, more prolonged in time, more powerful, and more varied in its many consequences than the previous revolutions. Just as the working classes were a prominent part of the historical scene in 1848 (Chartism and the June insurrection in Paris), they reappear under the more mature conditions of a decade later, inspired, however, by new aims and concepts. The old Chartist and Blanquist visions of a new order and the visions of the earlier Socialists, were replaced by pragmatic ideas and tendencies and new forms of organization and lines of action. To a greater or lesser extent these ideas and actions excluded participation in politics, whether revolutionary or nonrevolutionary. Yet, the great winds of change in the world, which brought about the liberation of American slaves, the emancipation of Russian serfs, and the unification of Italy, inevitably drew the workers away from their antipathy to politics and into active participation in politics. Also, the bitter experiences they had in their economic struggles made them realize the necessity of political involvement. It became their ambition to be present and active in all the movements for social and political progress, and they began to raise the standard of their own liberation from oppressive industrial conditions, political disenfranchisement, and unjust laws.

We need to qualify the use of the term *working class* (or classes, as it was in general use at that time). In the countries of Western Europe, particularly in Britain and France, it was usually the upper stratum of that class, the skilled workers, the “artisans,” who became organized in trade unions, cooperatives,

"resistance" societies, educational associations, and, eventually, in political organizations. Those "elites" of the working classes, strongly conscious of their interests, were determined to be the vanguard of all the laboring and exploited masses. This strengthened their importance in wider movements, but also led to the greater crystallization of their ideas of a wide all-embracing emancipation.

Numerous leaders appeared from among these working-class elites. They were highly articulate and full of vitality and courage. They initiated contacts with various circles: members of the radical intelligentsia, foreign revolutionaries living as exiles in their midst, progressive writers and publicists, ideologues of various persuasions, and, occasionally, professional politicians. The workers' vision was directed toward the citadels of power and toward acceptance as an integral part of the body politic. At the same time, some doctrines of destruction of the old powers and institutions and their replacement by a new order of society were revived. The idea of "liberating" or "emancipating" the working class had more than one meaning and interpretation.

The aim of this book is to show the emergence and evolution of the International Working Men's Association (IWMA), which went into history under the name of the First International, in the context of the general history of the decade 1864-1874 and the context of the worldwide movements of liberation. I also will show the major part the First International played in the process of revival and expansion of the West European labor movement. My intention was to amplify the numerous writings of professional historians, who for the last twenty or thirty years have been adopting professional principles and criteria. These writings are mostly monographs devoted to various aspects of the International's history—to particular countries, localities, and events. This recent literature is a departure from the writings of an earlier generation that concentrated on one or more institutions and on a few great figures. This earlier literature was animated by a militant spirit and often resembled works of ideological and political polemics. The writers broadly aligned themselves into partisans and apologists of the great rivals in the movement, Marx and Bakunin. Both camps saw in the history of the International not so much the workings of large social and economic forces, but rather the efforts and achievements of one or other of the great contenders. The history of the International was mainly seen in terms of Marx's and Bakunin's ideas and policies, their ambitions, and their mutual rivalry and conflict.

It is not my intention to belittle these partisan writers. Some of them were serious scholars. On the Marxian side, we find Jaechh, Mehring, Postgate, Steklov, and Riasanov, on the Bakuninian side, Guillaume, Nettlau, and Lehning, to name only the most important. Scholarly endeavor has often overcome partisan animosity. Some of these writings contain most valuable source material. Some of the authors were quite objective in treating their "greats."

The more professional contributions of recent times, listed in my Bibliography and cited in the book, had the salutary effect of "secularizing" the history of the International. This book is enriched by the excellent work of teams of

researchers who have given me most valuable printed collections of sources, usually superbly edited. A committed researcher has at present open access to many unpublished sources and rare printed material in such institutions as the International Institute of Social History in Amsterdam, the British Library in London, the Musée de l'histoire sociale in Paris, the Arhus Library in Barcelona, and elsewhere. The richness and availability of primary and secondary sources tempted me to construct a work of synthesis, which, I hope, will be a departure from most of the syntheses of the past, without rejecting nihilistically their intrinsic value.

The search into the history of the International reveals scores of fascinating personalities, often of great strength of character and integrity, as well as the inevitable odd fool and knave. These men, rarely women, were able to articulate interesting concepts and ideas, to absorb the teachings of the past and the present, and to integrate into them their own experiences and those of their circles. They initiated and led the various activities in their areas. Although normally amateurs, they developed great political skills, wrote articles and pamphlets, and appeared on platforms as excellent speakers. Beneath these leadership cadres emerged hundreds of activists and organizers. They were important in a local context, but en masse made an impact of varying importance on the general scene of the International. Through them the International became involved in the great workers' struggles of the periods, particularly in strikes, and so absorbed masses of ordinary workers, if only for a short time, within its orbit.

Many, probably most, of the leaders and activists within the local and regional organizations were unaware of the contending "schools" and parties that formed around the two (or three, if we count Engels) great personalities until these parties emerged fully into the open, presenting everybody with a choice. Not all took sides, but remained true to their own faith and, if necessary, left the organization whose principles and policies were no longer their own.

Like many other writers, even the most cool and objective, I could not escape the fascination of that great historical drama. I felt, naturally, a great empathy with so many of the people who tried to elevate the status and improve the lot of working men, women, and children and who fought for their emancipation, even if in the process they also fought among themselves over the principles by which they wanted to be guided and over the shape of the new society they wanted to achieve.

The Foundation

Who founded the International Working Men's Association? The claims are many. In 1877 Friedrich Engels wrote a short biography of his friend, Karl Marx, which included the following words: "In the meantime [during the early 1860s], the workers' movement in the various countries of Europe had once more gained so much strength that Marx could have considered bringing to fulfillment a wish cherished for a long time, the foundation of a Workers' Association embracing the most progressive lands of Europe and America."¹ This gave rise to a long tradition, and eventually both Marx and Engels were regarded as founders of the International. Ernst Fribourg, a leading member of the new organization in Paris, claimed the initiative for himself and his friends. In a letter to a Belgian friend, a French émigré in London Pierre Vésinier said that in 1864 he had spent five months "discovering all the workers, English, Poles, Germans, Italians, Swiss etc. and as a result of this the meeting at Saint Martin's Hall [during which the International was founded] took place."² But some time earlier, the same Vésinier ascribed a primary role to his two friends, Lefort and Le Lubez.³

Johann Philipp Becker, a German living in Geneva, also claimed to have founded the International. "In 1862," Becker wrote to his friend in New York, "I was the co-ordinator [*Miturheber*] of the International Democratic Congress from which sprang in 1864 the International Working Men's Association." Becker added that through the International he "acquired a systematic cosmopolitan-Communist sphere of activity."⁴

This by no means exhausts the list of claimants. In the great trial of the International in Paris in 1870, the state prosecutor attributed the conception of a

workers' international to Guiseppe Mazzini, the Italian exile in London. Mazzini has been named as the International's founder many times in the less enlightened literature on the subject. Mazzini never was a member of the International. Neither was the French revolutionary Auguste Blanqui, though legend has tried to fit him into the role of the founder.

Dealing with this controversial question of who founded the organization, a French workers' leader Benoît Malon gave the following answer: "In the same way that it has no masters, the International has no founders; it came into existence, with a bright future, out of the social necessities of our epoch and out of the growing sufferings of the working class."⁵ Meaningful as this is, it avoids answering the question of which particular individuals and groups were the agents that brought the pressures of their time to fruition.

The International Working Men's Association (IWMA) was founded at a meeting in London on 28 September 1864.⁶ The ostensible purpose of the meeting was to express sympathy for the Poles, whose recent uprising against Tsarist Russia had just been crushed. As early as March 1863 the pro-Polish workers' committee in London that led to the formation of the International had come into existence. It was composed of some forty trade-union leaders who met on the premises of the labor weekly the *Beehive*, and it organized meetings and petitions on behalf of fighting Poland.

The demands of these labor leaders of help for the Poles were more radical than those of other Polonophile centers.⁷ Great meetings were organized in London and elsewhere. Representatives of Parisian workers came to the meeting on 22 July 1863. A day later, another meeting of English and French leaders took place, with the participation of delegates sent by German and Polish societies. Once again, words of sympathy and solidarity for the Poles were expressed, but some new tones were heard. The day was not far off, said George Odger, the secretary of the London Trades Council, when workers of all countries would unite and war and oppression would be banished to give way to freedom and prosperity.⁸ A committee was elected and charged with the task of preparing the ground for a more permanent relationship. Eventually, English and French workers exchanged addresses. The meeting on 28 September 1864 and the organization named the International Working Men's Association resulted from these initiatives.

The authority elected at that meeting, the Central Committee (later called the Central Council, then renamed the General Council) with its seat in London, was predominantly English. The English members occupied the three main offices, that of the chairman, the secretary, and the treasurer. Most of them were members of the London Trades Council, the de facto ruling body of the British trade-union movement. Despite its originally nonpolitical orientation, this movement had become involved in political matters vitally affecting the working class.

The Working Men's Suffrage and Ballot Association sprang into existence in 1862. Three years later it changed into the Reform League, a body that com-

manded the support of vast numbers of workers and that successfully led the workers' fight for electoral reform. In 1864 the Working Men's Garibaldi Committee was formed to welcome the Italian hero to England. Having overcome certain initial antipathy to the North in the American Civil War, the *Beehive* and the trade-union leaders joined the middle-class radical John Bright and progressive intellectuals John Stuart Mill, Godwin Smith, Edward Spencer Beesly, and others for the defense of American democracy and for the cause of liberation of the Negro slaves. Yet it was the cause of Poland, taken up by several generations of European radicals and revolutionaries, that led to the establishment not just of a committee but also of an independent working-class organization, the National League for the Independence of Poland. Though the scope of activity and life span of the organization was limited, it had sections in London and the provinces and sold some 1,000 membership cards.

Most of the London trade-union leaders who took part in all of these initiatives sat on the platform at the founding meeting of the International and joined its Central Committee, along with representatives of London émigré circles.⁹ Forty-five-year-old George Odger, a shoemaker by trade, held the office of president. He had been the secretary of the London Trades Council since 1862, a position for which he received a remuneration of two shillings and sixpence a week. He stuck to his trade, like most trade-union leaders of that time, sacrificing his free time for public activities. A splendid organizer, he could speak and write with talent and flair. He chaired the meetings of the new organization's Central Committee and those of the subcommittee that carried out executive functions. A thirty-six-year-old carpenter, William Randall Cremer, was the general secretary. He had particularly good contacts with middle-class radical politicians. Prominent among the other English members were: Robert Applegarth, who was the secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners; the furniture maker Benjamin Lucraft, who took a prominent part in the agitation for electoral reform and in the pro-Polish movement; George Howell, a mason, whose position as secretary general of the Reform League made his participation in the International sporadic; and the printer Robert Hartwell, who was the coeditor of the *Beehive* and a prolific author of articles and pamphlets.

A printer, John Bedford Leno, put his printing works at the disposal of the International. Leno, like Howell and others, had been influenced in his youth by Chartism. But in the 1860s he leaned toward Christian Socialism. John Weston, a carpenter, was once a hired worker and now an employer. He was the sole representative on the committee of the moribund Owenite Socialism. He combined his Socialist creed with the advocacy of temperance as the means of elevating the working class from its state of misery and degradation. Both Leno and Weston wrote working-class poetry.

The workers' advocacy of Italian and Polish freedom and their siding with the cause of the North in the American Civil War indicated their growing awareness of international issues. It brought them closer to well-known leaders

whose help in their struggles the workers welcomed, and it also added to the strength of the trade-union movement and to the prestige of its leaders in wider radical circles. Some of the trade-union leaders, Odger for instance, openly sided with the European Red Democracy movement. The conflicts in America and Poland inspired trade-union leaders in the struggle for political equality, that is for full enfranchisement, at home. Emancipation of labor was the complement of Negro liberation in the United States and serf emancipation in Russia. Labor leaders advocated and practiced the solidarity of workers within the United Kingdom, a state containing four ethnic-national components. Various economic and cultural standards, differences in habits and mentality, "racial" antipathies, and religious divisions seriously affected relations between the English, Scottish, Welsh, and Irish workers—yet all these differences had been overcome time and again, as was manifested in the history of the workers' movements throughout the century and, in particular, in the Chartist movement. The London builders' strike in 1859–1861 enjoyed the sympathy, support, and financial help of workers from all parts of the United Kingdom. The extension of sympathy to workers in other countries seemed to follow naturally. This sympathy was stimulated by a growing cosmopolitan and internationalist zeitgeist.

A very practical concern, however, moved the British to establish a direct liaison with workers' organizations on the Continent. In order to defeat strikes, employers in the United Kingdom were importing foreign labor. Workers could stop this practice only through international solidarity. British trades-union leaders realized that, in the long run, they could eliminate such a danger only by helping workers on the Continent to build up effective unions on the English model and to achieve the standards of the British workers. Inadequate as these standards were, they presented a viable goal for workers in other countries. This idea was expressed best in the Address to French Workers, written by Odger in 1863:

A fraternity of peoples is highly necessary for the cause of Labour, for we find that whenever we attempt to better our social condition by reducing the hours of toil, or by raising the price of labour, our employers threaten us with bringing over Frenchmen, Germans, Belgians and others to do our work at a reduced rate of wages; and we are sorry to say that this has been done, though not from any desire on the part of our continental brethren to injure us, but through want of a regular and systematic communication between the industrious classes of all countries which we hope to see speedily effected, as our principle is to bring up the wages of the lesser paid to as near as possible with that of those who are better remunerated, and not to allow our employers to play off one against the other, and so drag us down to the lowest possible condition, suitable to their avaricious bargaining.¹⁰

This address paved the way for the establishment of the International some nine months after its publication.

"Self-help" and "self-improvement" were among the basic tenets of workers and their leaders, but this did not prevent them from seeking help from prominent middle-class and even upper-class leaders, who, for various reasons, were also interested in such collaboration. The Christian Socialists were particularly interested in collaborating with workers. They were untiring in their efforts to imbue workers with their principles, although their failure to cooperate productively with workers narrowed their appeal to workers.

A small band of followers of the French philosopher Auguste Comte was very involved in working-class activities. These English Positivists drew extremely radical political conclusions from Comte's general theories.¹¹ They advocated the overthrow of the monarchy and the substitution of a democratic republic with far-reaching social legislation in favor of the working classes. Their vision extended far beyond the British Isles, and they supported every movement and struggle against despotism. They advocated an international order based on full self-determination, the sovereignty of nations, and the establishment within each nation of a "social," not "Socialist," democratic order. Most prominent among these English positivists were Edward Spencer Beesly, professor of history at the London University, and Frederick Harrison, an excellent publicist. Both contributed regularly to the workers' journal the *Beehive*.

It was Beesly who led a workers' delegation to the prime minister, Lord Palmerston, on 18 May 1863, in order to press him for active support of the Polish uprising. Beesly presided at the meeting at Saint Martin's Hall on 28 September 1864 in which the International was founded. Neither Beesly nor Harrison chose to enter the new organization. The only Positivist who joined the International was Peter André Fox, an energetic and versatile journalist, an advocate of atheism and republicanism, and a staunch Francophile and Polonophile. He served on the International's Central Committee.

The International's leaders tried to draw into the committee another worker's friend, the London barrister Edmond Beales. A man of many talents and a fighter of many causes, Beales came into contact with the London trade-union world during its campaign for Polish freedom. This became his stepping stone toward wider involvement, in particular in the electoral franchise movement. Elected president of the Reform League, he gave invaluable services to this cause. Many of the men who sat with him on the Executive Council of the Reform League were concurrently members of the IWMA Central Committee. They attempted to bring Beales into the International but were prevented by what Howell called the "German influence."¹²

The most active London émigrés were the French. The intermediary between the French and the British was a young teacher of music and French, Victor Le Lubez. British by birth (he was born in Jersey) and education, he enjoyed the company of the French exiles in London, without sharing their Jacobin and Blanquist ideas. The French soon organized their own section of the International, which they called the French Branch.

Guiseppe Mazzini was the most famous among the political émigrés living in London at that time. The spiritual leader of the close Italian community, he also commanded the friendship of many British radicals, especially of the younger generation. He was invited to join the platform at the founding meeting of the International, along with two other émigrés, the Frenchman Ledru-Rollin and the German Marx, but, like the first and unlike the second, he refused to be involved personally. This did not prevent some of his followers, who were organized in Associazione di Mutuo Progresso, from participating in the new movement. One of them, Major Luigi Wolff, became a very active member of the Central Committee. The number of Italians on that committee soon rose to six, but it fell later.

The German contingent of the committee had a deeper and more lasting impact. A society of German workers, Der Deutsche Arbeiterbildungsverein [German Workers Educational Association] had existed in London since the 1840s. Its representative, Wilhelm Weber, participated in the meeting of 23 July 1863. The person most instrumental in drawing the Germans into the International was Johann George Eccarius, a German tailor who had lived in London since the forties. He was, at the time, a member of the Bund der Kommunisten for which Marx and Engels wrote the, by now largely forgotten, Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei. Eccarius was a man of talent and intelligence, and many people were impressed with his qualities, both in Britain and on the Continent. Moses Hess, the father of German Socialism, met him in 1868. He saw in Eccarius the amalgam of a German sixteenth-century Anabaptist and a French montagnard of 1793. A Swiss member of the International, James Guillaume, who met Eccarius in 1867, was strongly impressed by Eccarius's lecture on economics.¹³ As a member of the London Trades Council, Eccarius was the main intermediary between the English movement and German émigré circles in London. It was on his initiative that the forty-six-year-old Karl Marx appeared on the platform of the Saint Martin's Hall meeting; Marx's name was the last in the *Beehive* report listing members of the platform.

Marx arrived in Britain in August 1849 after a stormy period of activity during the German revolution. Distrustful both of émigré circles and of the British trade-unionists, he had kept aloof from political involvement, concentrating on theoretical studies. The only exceptions were his several interventions in German affairs. Occasionally, he met and corresponded with British friends. One of them was the old Chartist leader Ernest Jones, living in Manchester, who tried to involve Marx in the electoral reform movement. In one of his letters to Marx he wrote: "be our doctor politicus; call a great manhood suffrage meeting in London."¹⁴ This attests to Jones's esteem for Marx, but not to his sense of reality. In September 1864, having received the invitation from Eccarius, Marx came to realize, as he informed his friend in Manchester, Friedrich Engels, that there were "real powers" present this time and so he decided to accept the invitation to participate at the crucial gathering.¹⁵

While the British saw in the International a useful agency to combat strike-breaking and extend their influence abroad, the French, the Italian, and the German exiles regarded it as a vehicle to promote their various ideas of a new order. The Blanquists were absorbed mainly with the French situation and aimed at a revolution that would establish a revolutionary dictatorship on the ruins of the French empire, a dictatorship devoted to progressive, semi-Socialist changes. Their favored method was conspiracy. The Mazzinists thought in terms of a wider European revolution, but would not go beyond the aims of national emancipation and republican democracy. They also adhered to the methods of conspiratorial organization. Their master, Guiseppe Mazzini, rejected Socialism in any form, though he preached reforms in favor of the working classes and called on workers to organize themselves into self-help societies.

The revolutionary ideology of Marx was not well known. His own and his friend's earlier writings, if not completely unknown, had long since been forgotten. To other, especially non-German, members of the council, Marx was known as a German democrat and revolutionary, and they soon acknowledged his learning and his command of literary English. In the absence of any other well-known Continental leader on the council, his ascendancy was assured. Marx saw in the organization a genuine expression of workers' aspirations and recognized the International's capacity to expand into all the "civilized countries" (as Marx termed it more than once). He considered it his duty to spread proletarian class consciousness throughout the International. By *proletarian class consciousness*, Marx meant an understanding of the workings of the capitalist system and the necessity of an ever-widening organization and struggle of the working class, resulting in the working class's achievement of political power and full emancipation. Gradually and with adroitness, Marx disclosed his ideas in terms acceptable to most of his colleagues on the council.

Let us turn to France. Unlike the English, the French workers were strongly restricted by law in their activities, and they lacked any national organization or headquarters. Yet the reborn workers' movement of the early sixties found the means to express itself in coherent form and also found remarkable leaders, able to articulate the working-class demands and coordinate the manifold activities which by now had reached international proportions. The new movement aimed for "self-improvement" and for the "self-emancipation" of workers through the medium of mutual help societies, the only form of organization allowed to the workers by law. This movement soon went beyond the economic and social sphere and moved into national and international politics.

The outstanding leader of this movement was the bronze engraver Henri Louis Tolain.¹⁶ At the age of twenty he participated in the 1848 revolution, experiencing its defeats and disappointments. Through intense study, he acquired a wide knowledge that he used to great effect on the platform and in his writings. From 1863-1864 he was prominent on the French political scene and also in all the initiatives that led to contacts with the British.

He gathered around him a lively group of followers. Unlike the British, who drew their inspiration from various intellectual sources or none at all, Tolain and his friends adhered to the body of doctrine of Pierre Proudhon.¹⁷ Its essence was "mutuellisme," the idea of workers' emancipation through a network of mutually rendered help and services, which would lead to the abolition of the wage system and to the full emancipation of the producers. Distrustful of politics and of revolutionary politics in particular, Proudhon opposed all the other schools of Socialism. He vehemently denounced Communism, which he understood to be the doctrine of an all-embracing organization of society, controlled and regimented by state power without checks and limitations. He advocated a form of society free from any external power, a system he called An-Archy. Its economic foundation was to be the individual property of the producers, to be achieved through means of interest-free credit. Even workers' societies and cooperatives were only acceptable at a minimum level of organization, lest oppression crept back in disguise.

It is doubtful whether Tolain and his friends had sufficient time and energy to read all the volumes of the prolific ideologue Proudhon. Yet they eagerly absorbed some of his basic tenets. However, they had no scruples about rejecting any of his teachings whenever the teachings clashed with their pragmatic considerations. Without hesitation, they entered the field of politics.¹⁸ They also entered into relations with various leaders from other social strata, even members of the imperial court.

A prominent workers' friend in France was a young journalist, Henri Lefort. Coming from bourgeois-republican circles, he attempted to synthesize anti-Bonapartist politics with the principles of Proudhon. Another workers' friend was Armand Lévy, a man of various sympathies and interests. He was instrumental in bringing Parisian workers within the vortex of the pro-Polish movement during the insurrection against Tsarist Russia. Lévy did this despite Proudhon's strong antipathy to the Polish cause, which he denounced as the cause of nobles and priests directed against the Tsar's peasant emancipation. Tolain composed a petition on behalf of the fighting Poles, which he handed to the emperor in the name of French workers. The journey of the six Parisian delegates to the London meeting on 22 July 1863 was financed by the Parisian representative of the Polish National Government (the secret body directing the insurrection), Prince Czartoryski.¹⁹

Further initiatives from the French side were interrupted by the elections to the Corps Législatif, the parliament of the empire. The workers' leaders decided to participate in the elections, although, once again, participation contradicted Proudhon's teachings. Defeated in their attempt to obtain seats, they emerged content with their newly gained contacts and experiences.

The Paris section of the International was established at the beginning of 1865. Tolain was the recognized leader. A prominent member was Ernst Fribourg, an engraver, who like Tolain was endowed with political and literary talents. Tolain and Fribourg became the corresponding secretaries of the Paris

section, and they were joined by Charles Limousin. The three secretaries formed the core of a bureau. It was composed of twenty members to avoid contravening the laws that set the limit of any assembly without specific authorization at twenty people.

Some of the bureau members deserve attention. One member was the 25-year-old bookbinder Eugène Varlin. He was the son of a poor peasant family. He had come to Paris and by determination had acquired skill and wide knowledge. Involved since 1858 in the bookbinders' mutual-aid society that embraced both workers and their employers, he led workers to form their own independent organization. His closest friend in the bureau was the 22-year-old engraver Antoine Bourdon who also had come from the provinces. Two other men in their twenties were prominent: Benoît Malon, a dyer, and Zéphirin Camélinat, a bronze-metal setter. Both were recent arrivals in Paris. Many others were involved in the young movement, and they formed a colorful mosaic of class backgrounds, occupations, and involvements. One member, Chernalé, was a nonworker, describing his profession as a "commis d'architecte." Chernalé mastered Proudhon's doctrine better than anyone else in the International.

With a few exceptions, two things stand out about the Paris members of the International: their youth and their status as highly skilled artisans, engaged in various light and often luxury industries. They moved between positions of hired labor and self-employment. They sought economic salvation and social advancement for themselves and for others through mutual aid and cooperation. They were proud of their skills and their superior status within the general mass of working people, though they thought of themselves as missionaries on behalf of all workers. (At the trial of the International in 1870 in Paris the prosecutor referred to one of the accused: "Héligon, qui exerce je ne sais quelle profession." Héligon protested: "Eh bien! Je declare au tribunal que je proteste contre cela; car dans le monde ou je vis, dans le monde des honnêtes gens, un homme qui exerce on ne sait quelle profession passe pour un vagabond."²⁰) They participated in movements for popular education and temperance which gave them opportunities to meet leaders from other classes. Their search for independence brought them some bitter experiences and defeats, as in the elections of 1863 and 1864; yet they did not give up.

Despite the fact that the class divisions within the International's circles in Paris were blurred and that even Tolain and Fribourg could be described only with great difficulty as members of the proletariat, the first split that took place within the organization was on the grounds of its supposed class nature. The first victim was Henri Lefort. A friend and ally of Tolain's, he turned into an "enemy," as soon as he aimed for one of the positions of command in the International. He applied successfully to the Central Committee in London for the position of a press representative ("literary defender") of the International in France. Although the London authority rejected the principle that nonworkers could not perform any leading functions, upon protests from Paris Lefort's appointment was annulled and he soon withdrew from the International.²¹

A more serious problem was the attempt by the followers of Blanqui in Paris to penetrate into and eventually take over the leadership of the new organization. Their friends in London dominated the French Branch and were represented in the Central Committee. Their leader, Auguste Blanqui, first from the prison of Sainte Pélagie in Paris and then from Brussels to where he escaped in 1865, denounced with bitter irony all the other varieties of Socialism, including the teachings of Proudhon, who in his turn saw in "blanquisme" a doctrine and movement that sought to impose a ruthless dictatorship and an all-embracing dictatorial state.²² The Parisian Blanquists denounced Tolain and his friends as "petit bourgeois," corrupted by connections with the imperial palace and the bourgeois world. The Blanquists were mostly students, clerks, commercial employees, and so on, yet they claimed to be the true vanguard of the proletarian cause. Inevitably, the conflict had to be resolved. "We are a study society and not a new charbonnerie," said Fribourg at a meeting of the Paris section, and his view prevailed.²³

Shortly after the foundation of the Paris section, a section was established in Lyon. It cooperated directly with the council in London, to which it also sent during 1865-1866 a contribution of £8,²⁴ twice the sum sent from Paris. In July 1867 London granted the Lyon section the authority of a central committee for the whole Rhône region.²⁵ During 1866 a section was founded in Rouen. Its most prominent member was the thirty-seven-year-old lithographer Hector Aubry. He too was a "mutuelliste," favoring peaceful change of the economic system and opposing revolution.

If both Britain and France could claim to be the birthplace of the Workers' International, Switzerland and Belgium were drawn almost immediately into the International's vortex, thus extending the area in which civilization, industrial progress, cultural achievements, and the flourishing of ideas were at their height. Belgium and Switzerland, like Britain and unlike France, were countries in which political liberty was shared in varying degrees by all classes of the population. The two countries had one common characteristic: their societies were multiethnic and multilingual; both were strongly drawn into the French cultural sphere.

No Swiss or Belgian representatives were involved in the initiatives that led to the foundation of the International. However, workers in both countries created sections of the organization and communicated with the authority in London. Geneva was the main Swiss center.²⁶ The peculiarities of this city deserve attention. Out of a population of 82,000 only half were full citizens and about one-third were foreigners; the rest were Swiss from other parts of Switzerland. Many of the indigenous workers were employed in the watchmaking industry. They were concentrated in the Saint-Gervais district where according to a Swiss writer, "a peculiar district mentality, a kind of politically radical local patriotism" had developed.²⁷ These workers also had a strong feeling of pride in being above the mass of unskilled workers in the social echelon. The skilled workers, collectively known as "fabrique," were mostly watchmakers but also

were carpenters, tailors, shoemakers, and others. They all had their trade associations that were recognized by law. These workers tended strongly toward political independence. (In an article entitled "Genève et genèvois," Marc Monier writes: "Genève depuis vingt ans [i.e. since the 1840s] a tout à fait changé de caractère. . . . C'est un champ d'experimentation, c'est une terre où les systemes les plus divers viennent essayer leur force. . . . C'est à Genève enfin que la république sociale, formant un parti politique, a librement formulé ses prétensions.")²⁸

The unskilled workers, "gros métiers," were mostly engaged in the building industry. The majority of foreigners who came to search for work, mainly from Germany, Italy, and France, belonged to that category. Skilled workers, members of the various professions, and students were prominent among the political émigrés who were more numerous in Geneva than in other places.

Geneva became the home of Johann Philipp Becker, a German democrat and participant in the 1848 revolution. Apart from the various trades and occupations that he had exercised in his life,²⁹ his main passion was politics. As soon as the International was formed in London, Becker established contact with Marx and also with Hermann Jung, the Swiss secretary on the Central Council. At the beginning of 1865 two sections were formed in Geneva, one German and the other French. The German section was composed mostly of German immigrants, but it also recruited members among the German-speaking Swiss. The French section included local Swiss and French émigrés. Poles and Russians, who could normally speak much better French than German, also joined that section. Its leading figure was the French bookbinder Jean Baptiste Dupleix. The two sections formed a joint committee. Soon Becker's section grew into a "Sektionsgruppe der deutschen Sprache," which embraced individuals and sections in other parts of Switzerland and abroad. In January 1866 Becker launched a monthly publication *Der Vorbote*, which was subtitled *Politische und Social-oekonomische Zeitschrift*. Through it, he acquired a medium for his propaganda. He also established contacts in Italy, especially in Milan, and it was under his influence that Stampa, a leader of workers' associations in that city, declared his solidarity with the International.³⁰

Lausanne, on the northern shore of Lake Geneva, became the second center of the International in Switzerland. As in Geneva, separate French and German sections were established. Of greater importance to the International than Lausanne was the region of the Jura Mountains. In that region, the watchmaking industry was suffering under the impact of the growing factory production. La Chaux-de-Fonds was the center of the workers' movement in the Jura Mountains. It was the seat of the medical doctor Pierre Coullery. Coming from a working-class family, he was sensitive to the miseries of life and work of that class. His teachings were permeated with ethical and religious principles. He supported workers' efforts to organize trade-union and cultural associations, promoted temperance, and, at the same time, advocated for workers' political independence.³¹ In the 1860s Coullery became interested in Proudhonism, which

brought him closer to trade-union leaders in Paris. Inspired by these leaders, he founded in July 1865 a section of the International in Chaux-de-Fonds. It became, after Geneva, the strongest center in Switzerland. Soon Coullery began publishing *La Voix de l'Avenir*, which in 1867 acquired the subtitle *Journal de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs*.

Another center of the International in Jura was founded in the town of Locle. In Locle a young language teacher, James Guillaume, gained recognition and influence. At first, the section consisted of five members: Guillaume; Placide Bise, also a teacher; a clerk, Fritz Hugenin; a watchmaker, Paul Debout; and an aristocrat with revolutionary sympathies, Constant Meron. They and later members of the section had in those early days only very vague ideas about Socialism and the emancipation of labor, according to Guillaume.³² Guillaume soon turned from a moderate and reformist course toward a revolutionary one. A twenty-two-year-old watchmaker in Saint Immortal, Adhemar Schwitzguébel, was his close friend and ally.

Belgium became the next center of the IWMA.³³ In Belgium, as elsewhere, it was the "elite" of the working class, the skilled artisans, who were organized. Unlike in Britain, but as in France, workers' associations were restricted by law to "self-help." As elsewhere, attempts were made at cooperative production, but they largely failed. French émigrés, who were present in Belgium in larger numbers than in Britain or in Switzerland, established contacts with workers' circles and inspired them to more determined activity. For some time, Brussels was Proudhon's place of exile, and many of his writings were published there. Young middle-class radicals aimed to involve workers in political issues: democratization of the existing electoral franchise, limitation of the influence of the Catholic church, reform of the military service, and reform of the educational system.

A society called *Le Peuple* was founded in 1861 and it published a paper, *La Tribune du Peuple*. *Le Peuple* described its platform as that of "démocratie militante," which embraced both political and social demand.³⁴ The most prominent man in *Le Peuple* was the printer Désiré Brismée. Born in Ghent in 1822, he established himself in Brussels, where he participated in various activities. In 1847–1848 he belonged to the Democratic Association, which united Belgians with many political exiles, one of whom was Karl Marx. *La Tribune de Peuple* was printed in Brismée's printing works and he himself published numerous articles in its columns. His main associate was César De Paepe from Antwerp. De Paepe learned typesetting under Brismée, and the two became bound together not only by shared interests and ideas but also by family ties: De Paepe married Brismée's eldest daughter.

Brismée, De Paepe, and their friends were imbued with Socialist ideas. Their Socialism arose out of a synthesis of Proudhonism with the teachings of original Belgian thinkers.³⁵ One of them was Baron Jean Hippolyte De Colins (1783–1859). He preached in his writings a "rational" order of society based on collective ownership of means of production, in particular of land and mineral

resources. He opposed revolution, as it would bring chaos and lawlessness. According to De Colins, the hope of humanity lay in creating a social system based on "social science." Enlightened aristocracy would be called to play a role in the endeavour. Another preacher of collective ownership and state credit for workers was Napoléon De Kayser. He also advocated the organization of industrial and agricultural workers' associations and a universal system of education. De Paepe considered De Kayser to be, in his science and erudition, below Proudhon, Marx, De Colins, and Comte, but he presented his ideas in a simple and clear style.³⁶ Both De Colins and De Kayser visualized, as part of the new system, small-scale enterprises, able to lease the means of production from the public authorities. Of course, the enemies of Socialism saw in any doctrine of collective ownership Communism, which had been for decades the great fear of small proprietors. De Paepe in one of his articles rejected the application of that term to the principles held by himself and his associates: "We regard Communism as impossible in our epoch, as contrary to all the intellectual tendencies of the century, striving not only towards equality and levelling of social conditions, but also towards liberty and the full enfranchisement of the individual."³⁷ Within a short time De Paepe had moderated that view.

The initiative to extend the International into Belgium came from the Central Committee in London. In view of the constant flow of strikebreakers from Belgium into Britain, establishing the International in Belgium was imperative. Le Lubez, into whose hands Belgian matters were committed, and Karl Marx, who soon succeeded him in that task, in turn tried to establish contacts in Brussels. Eventually, a young journalist, André Fontaine, was approached. Although he was provided with all the authorizations and membership cards, he made no headway. Then, in April 1865, labor leaders formed a committee in Brussels to organize Sunday meetings for workers. At one of the meetings a letter from Paris was read that touched upon the question of the International and its proposed congress during the summer of 1865. As a result of this meeting, a section of the International was formed with sixty members. Though Fontaine claimed to be the representative of the London council, he was deposed, and the Central Council had no option but to accept it. De Paepe, who was instrumental in removing Fontaine, used an argument similar to the one that had been used against Lefort in Paris. De Paepe declared his refusal to take part in a committee that would not be composed of manual workers, the "true proletarians."³⁸ Yet De Paepe made an exception in relation to Marx's assumption of the post of corresponding secretary for Belgium. He praised Marx as the advocate of "l'extinction complète du parasitisme et du pauperisme, du bourgeoisisme et du prolétariat."³⁹

The Belgian organization of the International had inherited and improved upon the ideological eclecticism of *Le Peuple*. This was clearly demonstrated in the "Workers' Manifesto" issued by the Brussels committee in connection with the electoral campaign at the beginning of 1866. The Belgians watched with fascination the reform movement in Britain. They too aimed to achieve suffrage

for workers. The manifesto urged the working class to follow the example of the bourgeoisie, which, well organized and determined, had won for itself rights, privileges, and economic predominance. The document urged reforms of taxation, military service, the educational system, housing policies, and trade-union laws.⁴⁰

Let us return to the scene in London. The committee chosen at the meeting at Saint Martin's Hall, soon renamed the Central Council and eventually the General Council, proceeded to establish the new organization on a firm footing. Corresponding secretaries were elected to establish connections abroad. Together with the three main office holders, these secretaries constituted the subcommittee that performed the functions of an executive, acting on behalf of the council. The council soon considered drafting the program and the statutes of the IWMA. Le Lubez, Weston, and Wolff undertook this matter. The texts they proposed raised controversies, and the final task of editing these texts was placed in the hands of Marx. By the end of October he completed his task. He wrote his own versions, taking little from the other drafts. Marx's texts were accepted unanimously and even enthusiastically. They were soon printed. The two texts were the *Inaugural Address* and the *Provisional Statutes of the International Working Men's Association*. They were subsequently translated into other languages.⁴¹

The members of the council who voted to accept these documents and put their signatures to them were scarcely aware of the ideological roots from which they had sprung. Marx wrote in a language that would be understood by his colleagues on the council. He felt compelled to include from the other drafts certain concepts like "truth," "morality," "justice," "rights and duties," which were aversive to him because of their abstraction and ambiguity but which he thought could do no harm. The dominant spirit of the two texts was his own, and the main ideas differed only in phraseology from those to be found in the *Communist Manifesto*, which he and Engels had composed some seventeen years earlier. However, he included in the address certain results of his research into the workings of the Capitalist system, later treated extensively in the major work of his life, *Das Kapital*, the first volume of which appeared in 1867. The address ends with the concluding words of the *Communist Manifesto*: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!"

The principles embodied in the address were reiterated in the statutes. They defined the structure and the rules of the International. The International was to consist of societies in different localities and countries. Their first task was to form themselves into national bodies with their own central authorities; this task, however, being subject to the particular laws in each country. These societies would send representatives to a general congress that would meet once a year. The congress was to appoint the Central Council, which would form an "international agency between the different cooperating associations." The council was to account for its activities to the congress. It was to cooperate

closely with the national bodies, yet independent local societies were to have the right to correspond directly with the Central Council.

A curious passage in the statutes indicated that, unlike on the Continent where national associations were envisaged, in Britain only individual members were to be enlisted, at least up to the convocation of the first congress. In fact, the council, apart from performing its functions as the highest authority of the International, behaved very much like a section or a club. In spite of this provision, the French émigrés, as mentioned before, constituted themselves into a separate branch. Also a German and a Polish society in London were affiliated. The statutes did not distinguish between member societies and affiliated bodies.

Marx's authorship of these basic documents established his intellectual ascendancy within the council. Under his influence, the subcommittee (the standing committee) was "reorganized," in fact reactivated, in September 1865. The new subcommittee included five Englishmen: Odger, Weston, Howell, Dell, and Fox, and five members of other nationalities: Marx, Eccarius, Dupont, Jung, and Bobczynski. The German Eccarius, the Frenchman Dupont, and the Swiss Jung were close friends of Marx. The Polish exile, Konstanty Bobczynski, though not a revolutionary Socialist, was always ready to support the most Polonophile member of the council. The English members were strongly preoccupied with the newly formed Reform League, which was campaigning for a democratic electoral franchise, and that preoccupation obviously strengthened the "Marx circle."

In accordance with the rules, the London council envisaged convening the first congress in 1865 and chose Brussels as the place. Lack of time for sufficient preparation prevented the congress from being held. In addition, the hardening of the laws on aliens in Belgium made this plan impossible. Therefore, the council decided to convene a conference in London of representatives from the different countries rather than a congress. The conference took place from 25 to 29 September 1865.⁴² Paris was represented by a delegation composed of Tolain, Fribourg, Varlin, and four others. Geneva sent its most prominent leaders, Becker and Dupleix. De Paepe came from Brussels. The participation of London members of the council was *ex officio*. The conference had day and evening sittings. The membership of the day sittings consisted of the delegates from abroad and of members of the standing committee, while the evening sittings were attended by other members of the council and even by outsiders.

Continental delegates reported the progress achieved in their countries. What they said was far from optimistic. Fribourg reported that 1,200 membership cards were distributed in Paris, yet the financial position was difficult because of the heavy expenses. Therefore, there was "little or no balance left to hand over to the Central Council." The French were working under harsh legal restraints. Dupleix reported that in Switzerland the International had 550 members. This probably included only the French-speaking sections, as a little later Becker triumphantly informed the conference that in Geneva alone the organization had

1,500 members; in all probability that number included affiliated societies of all kinds. De Paepe reported the very modest number of Belgian members—sixty.

Cremer, informing on the state of affairs in Britain, tried to dispel the illusions of the Continental members about the financial resources of the British trade unions. The unions were not easily persuaded to give money, he said. He also complained that the trade unions knew nothing of politics and that it was difficult to make them understand that there was such a science. And yet, there were signs of progress: trade-union members listened to members of the International and approved of their principles.

The main debates at the conference concerned the program the congress planned for the next year. The conference was faced with two programs, one coming from Paris and the other from the London council. The Paris proposal, published in the press a few weeks earlier, contained eleven points.⁴³ Yet it was the London document, coming from the pen of Marx, that the conference discussed. Marx's text took into consideration some points in the Paris proposal, and when it came to a vote it was passed almost without amendments. One point, however, the "religious idea," was excluded by Marx. He and other Londoners firmly opposed the inclusion of any matter relating to religion, fearing that this would lead to unnecessary divisions between members. According to Carter, the International "had nothing to do with dogmas or creeds" and "there should be no interference between a man's conscience and his god." Yet a majority of eighteen out of thirty-one voting at the evening meeting of 27 September decided in favor of including this point. De Paepe complained later about the reactionary attitude of the English in this respect. They did not understand that they could not be democrats and Socialists, while being faithful to their Anglican religion.⁴⁴

The most controversial point discussed by the conference concerned the freedom of Poland. A firm stand was defended by Bobczynski and Wheeler, but there is little doubt that the spirit behind this stand was Marx. The International was invited to declare that the annihilation of Russian influence in Europe was imperative and that the right of self-determination, as applied to Poland, should result in reconstituting that country on a "social and democratic basis." Despite opposition, the proposal was adopted by a large majority. Vésinier, reporting on the conference, maintained that the Central Committee changed into a "Polish Committee."⁴⁵ His memory must have failed him when, some time later, writing about the London conference, he maintained that not just Marx but also the French leaders were all inspired by Count Zamoyski, the Polish leader in London. The French, by 1865, lost their enthusiasm for Poland and were among Marx's opponents on this question.⁴⁶

In September 1866, two years after the International had been founded and a year after the conference in London, the first congress was convened in Geneva, with sixty delegates participating.⁴⁷ London sent seven members of the Central Council: Odger, Cremer, Carter, Lawrence, Eccarius, Jung, and Dupont. Seventeen delegates, led by Tolain, came from France. Three delegates represented

Germany. The majority of delegates were Swiss. Becker and his associates in Geneva formed the committee that was charged with preparing the congress. No delegate was sent from Belgium. Linguistically, the French-speaking delegates were in a majority of three to one. The congress opened on 3 September and closed on 8 September. It was presided over by Hermann Jung, the most versatile linguist among the delegates.

At the outset, the proceedings were disturbed by the appearance of a group of ten Parisians, followers of Blanqui. They were all removed and that brought to an end Blanquist interference in the affairs of the International for some time.

The London delegates brought with them a text of "instructions." It was a memorial written by Marx that dealt point by point with all the questions included in the program of the congress.⁴⁸ Of importance was Marx's treatment of the problem of trade unions and strikes. Marx praised the unions but also criticized them for not yet fully understanding their power of acting against the system of wage slavery itself. Four other points dealt with questions affecting the life and welfare of the working class. They were: limitation of the working day, juvenile and child labor, cooperation between workers, and taxation. An eight-hour working day, proclaimed by the American workers, was declared to be "the common platform of the working classes all over the world." The tendency of modern industry to draw juveniles and children of both sexes into the productive process was seen as "progressive, sound and legitimate," although this became an abomination under capitalism. Cooperation was praised as destined to supersede the present system with the republican system of the association of free and equal producers. Yet to realize the complete transformation of society, the transfer of the "organised forces of society, i.e. the state power," from capitalists and landlords to the producers themselves must be achieved. One matter of international importance was treated by Marx at length: the Polish question was considered in well-known Marxian terms, denouncing Russia as the "dark Asiatic power."

The French also brought a memorial.⁴⁹ It was written by Chémalé. Like its counterpart from London, it dealt with all the points of the program, only at a much greater length. It was a brief encyclopedia of Proudhon's ideas, and it contained numerous quotations from his writings. The last topic in the French document concerned Poland. The French declared their protest against all despotisms, especially Russian despotism, whose organization and social tendencies must lead inevitably to the "most brutalising communism." But the document said that an "economic congress," as that of the International, should not pass an opinion on the political reconstruction of Poland.

The delegates were divided over the matter of strikes. The principle of strike action was defended by the delegates from London, who thought that one of the main duties of the IWMA was the prevention of international strikebreaking. The main opponents to the principle of strike action were the French and Swiss Proudhonists. They saw in mutual-help societies and cooperatives the means to assure economic independence and so the emancipation of the workers.

After heated debates, the congress accepted all the proposals in the London memorial with some minor additions. The resolution on cooperation, proposed by London, met with general approval. The French delegates overlooked formulations that would have disagreed with their doctrine, in particular on the transfer—that is, retention—of state power. However, the French delegates were critical of the London proposals regarding the employment of children and juveniles. They also brought up the subject of the employment of women, omitted from the London document. The French condemned the employment of women and children in industry as the main cause of the “degeneration of the human species” and a powerful means of demoralization in the hands of the “capitalist caste.” Woman’s place was the domestic hearth and she must remain the “natural educator of the child.” Children and juveniles should be given professional education, theoretical and practical, but in such a way that this did not give rise to a new aristocracy of worker-directors, based on educational privilege. Doctor Coullery spoke on the subject with great passion. He said that the place of women is at home with the children. By giving women their due and protecting them from pernicious influences, they would become the mainstay of liberty and democracy. Eventually, a majority accepted both proposals on the subject, the London and the Paris ones, ignoring any contradiction between the two.

Proudhonist ideas and concepts won even more easily in matters ignored by the London instructions. The French suffered a setback, however, in the religious question. They proposed a resolution condemning the pernicious influence of religious ideas on social, political, and intellectual development. Most delegates were persuaded by Odger’s objection that such a resolution would damage the International. Tolain, one of the promoters of the French resolution, expressed his skepticism; he counted rather on the progress of science and education than on action of the International. Finally, it was agreed to record in the congress protocol all the proposals and views on that question without taking a vote.

It was the Polish question that became the subject of the most vehement controversy. Becker, the firmest defender of the proposal from London, maintained that the liberation of Poland meant the hastening of freedom for the Russian people. Becker said that the medieval conditions prevailing in Russia determined her warlike character, and, therefore, Russia presented a permanent danger to the culture and free development of Europe. The English delegates supported the cause of Poland on the grounds that this cause always had been treated with sympathy by the “democratic and intelligent part of the English people.” The French delegates stuck to their guns, but finally a compromise was reached. Becker proposed an amendment that substantially changed the tone and content of the London proposal. Its text ran: “As the IWMA undertakes the task of emancipating the working class of all countries and so fighting every oppressive power and realising the equality of all men and all nations, included in this task are the elimination of the imperialist influence of Russia and the reconstruction of a social-democratic Poland.” This amendment was signed by a

number of delegates and accepted together with the resolution proposed by the French into the protocol of the congress without a vote.⁵⁰

The congress accepted a text of statutes based essentially on the version written by Marx and accepted by the London council two years before. There were some subtle differences. In the original document, the struggle for the emancipation of the working classes was considered to be the struggle for "equal rights and duties and the abolition of class rule." In the text adopted by the congress the words *abolition of class rule* were omitted. Another passage of the original was changed. In it, the economic emancipation of the working classes was considered to be the "great end to which every political movement ought to be subordinate as means," while in the text adopted in Geneva *as means* was missing. As the new text of the statutes was in French, it was accepted without question by the French-speaking delegates, while others were not aware of these differences. Yet, in subsequent conflicts within the International the omitted words became a bone of contention between those who preached political involvement and those who preached abstention from politics of any kind.

A minor controversy flared up about rights to hold offices in the International. Some delegates wanted to restrict such a right to manual workers. Tolain and Fribourg, whose own social status was somewhat ambiguous, insisted on it with particular vigor. They expressed the fear that the International might be dominated by "bourgeois" Red Republicans or by Blanquists. Vuilleumier, the delegate from La Chaux-de-Fonds, cited the outstanding example of Doctor Coullery, while Cremer and Carter spoke of Marx, whose services to the movement were of utmost importance. An interesting point was made by Carter. The rising bourgeoisie had not been reluctant to accept the help of men of intellect who gave them the bourgeois economic science and served their power and prestige. Therefore, the workers should welcome the help of men capable of defeating the pretensions of those theorists. The "manuellistes" lost on this point.

It seems that despite controversies, all the delegates to the congress derived great satisfaction from its results. The English delegates thought that they had won on most points. Proudhonist publications in France and Belgium praised the congress for presumably giving affirmation to the principles of mutuality. Finally, Marx expressed his satisfaction in a letter to one of his friends in Germany. The congress, he thought, brought results beyond his expectations and it made an impact on France, England, and even America. Of no account were the "Parisian gentlemen," their heads full of Proudhonist phraseology.⁵¹

Metamorphoses

Once the International was on a firm foundation, its membership began to grow, and it expanded territorially. The International extended the range of its activities, and the ideological complexion of particular organizations began to change under the impact of problems and conflicts. However, the center in London experienced changes of a different sort—a contraction of membership and activity.

The Geneva congress had approved the membership of the council in London, with the exception of Le Lubez. The English formed the absolute majority among the approximately fifty members. Several Frenchmen, Germans, and Poles, and also a Swiss, a Dane, A Belgian, a Dutchman, and a Hungarian were members of the council. This was, however, the nominal list, by no means identical with the real body of those who worked in and for the council. Between eight and seventeen members participated in the council meetings.

Odger's attendance became sporadic, and he was removed from the presidency, an office that was abolished altogether. Another English member, William Cremer, had to resign from the office of general secretary in favor of André Fox who, at the meeting of 25 September 1866, won the office in a ballot by a majority of thirteen to four.¹ Cremer must have felt angry and humiliated, and he soon gave up his seat. From that time on, the office of general secretary was not the happiest one. Fox did not show enthusiasm or dedication. Eventually, he resigned in favor of Robert Shaw, a painter by trade, whose loyalty and assiduity exceeded his competence. Eccarius, the most loyal friend of Marx, assumed the office in September 1867 while Shaw became the treasurer.

Fox's story is quite interesting. A journalist by profession, he had to struggle hard to earn a living. Dissatisfied with his unpaid function as the council's secretary, he was glad to be relieved of it. He still remained the "American" corresponding secretary, but used the knowledge he had acquired about the labor scene in the United States for journalistic purposes. This caused a row in the council. Fox resigned his office and disappeared from that body.

Only a few representatives of the English trade-union movement remained active in the council. The most prominent were Matthew Lawrence and James Carter, secretaries of the tailors' and hairdressers' unions respectively. The council had intervened successfully in strikes within these trades by preventing the importation of strikebreakers from abroad.² From the General Council's report to the second congress of the International it appears that before September 1866, seventeen British trade societies, mostly local or union branches, were affiliated to the International—but six of them paid no subscription in the following eight months. The list of affiliated societies, including some societies that paid a contribution without formal affiliation, leaves no doubt as to their character. They represented trades that were unaffected, or very little affected, by mechanization and in which manual skilled work predominated. These groups included tailors, shoemakers and bootmakers, cigarmakers, cabinet-makers, cordwainers, ribbonmakers, block printers, coach trimmers, bookbinders, and so on.

At meetings after the Geneva congress the General Council discussed the question of affiliating the London Trades Council (LTC). The chances seemed good, considering that Odger was that body's secretary. What is more, the Trade Union Conference in Sheffield in August 1866 had recommended to the various societies that they affiliate with the IWMA, on the grounds that this was "essential to the progress and prosperity of the entire working community."³ Several months later, the London Trades Council passed a resolution in favor of "regular intercommunication" of workers in different countries "for the purpose of regulating the hours of labour and assimilating wages." The LTC resolved to cooperate with the International, at the same time continuing as a distinct and independent body.⁴ In a letter to his German correspondent, Marx announced that the LTC might become "the British section of the International Association," in which case the "government of the working class here will, in a certain sense, pass to us."⁵ It is not easy to guess whether this was an expression of a genuine, but unfulfilled, hope or a move by Marx to impress a friend and through him certain circles in Germany.

A major reason that the English members became less active in the General Council was their absorption into the organization and campaigns of the Reform League. They participated more fully and wholeheartedly in that body than in the International. The Reform League, founded in October 1865, had turned into a powerful mass movement throughout the United Kingdom. In April 1867, according to its register, the league possessed 444 branches, of

which 107 were in London. Four regional federations existed. Autonomous organizations were founded in Scotland and Ireland.⁶ In one of his letters, Howell, the general secretary of the league, estimated that 2 million people attended its meetings between July and October 1866, when the movement was at its height.⁷

In another letter to his German friend, Dr. Ludwig Kugelmann in Hanover, Marx ascribed to himself a major role in the reform movement. "The Reform movement here, which our Central Council (*quorum magna pars fui*) brought into being, has by now acquired immense and irresistible dimensions. I stayed behind the scenes and I do not worry any more about the matter since it is going well."⁸ This view had no basis in reality. Any ties between the International and the Reform League were reduced to some overlapping of membership within the two authorities and some patronage of both organizations by the London Trades Council. Yet the role of the International in the vision of the LTC became more and more esoteric, while the successes of the Reform League enhanced the strength and prestige of the trade-union movement. As time went on, the recognized leaders of English labor within the International's General Council were replaced by some second-rank or even obscure leaders.

An exception among the newcomers was John Hales, who joined the council at the beginning of 1866. He represented the Elastic Webb-Weavers Society, with a membership of no more than fifty. At meetings of the council Hales began raising the matter of forming English branches on the Continental pattern.⁹ He found support among other English members, but met with opposition from Marx, who disliked the idea of "turning our Association into a debating club."¹⁰ Hales raised the issue again several years later.

Some contact was established between the Reform League and the International when a number of London leaders began a new publication. The main publication of the workers' movement in the 1860s was the *Beehive*, edited by George Potter. The paper published detailed and sympathetic reports about the activities of the International and the Reform League. In autumn 1865 Potter and his friends quarrelled with the main London leaders, and although the quarrel was of personal nature, it took the form of struggle over principles. In the end, Potter's opponents formed the Industrial Newspaper Company. Marx became a codirector, and a small journal acquired by the company and renamed *Workman's Advocate* was recognized by the General Council of the IWMA as its official organ. Soon, financial difficulties forced the publishers to change the title of the paper. Beginning in February 1866 the paper was called *The Commonwealth*, a name that could appeal to more than workers. Concerned that the paper might fall into the hands of "bourgeois elements," Marx succeeded in getting Eccarius appointed editor.¹¹ In April Odger took over as editor. *The Commonwealth* was now reluctant to publicize its connection with the International, calling itself in its subtitle the "organ of the reform movement." Marx, despite opportunities, refrained from contributing to the paper, but Engels published in its columns a series of articles on the perennial Polish question. During

its short period of existence, *The Commonwealth* showed that it was open to various influences and inspirations: Positivist, Christian Socialist, bourgeois radical, and so on. It is interesting to note that in one of its articles the philosopher Comte was praised, and the author predicted that his influence in this and the coming centuries would be great.¹² Despite its wide platform, *The Commonwealth* ceased publication in July 1867. Potter's *Beehive* continued to prosper, and its relations with the IWMA improved.

The League finally won electoral reform in August 1867. The Reform Act admitted to the franchise about one-third of the adult male population, doubling the number of men who could vote. The working class became an influential and numerically dominant part of the electorate in the cities and boroughs. The act contained the prospect of a further extension of the franchise, in particular into the county constituencies, and also of the introduction of a secret ballot, the sine qua non of democratic elections. Though the Reform League had not achieved its aims completely, it could consider itself the victor.

The General Council shed most of the English members who were engaged in the league, yet a legend was building up on the Continent that claimed for the International a part it had never played. Dupont, the French secretary of the General Council, was instrumental in creating that legend. In a letter dated 17 April 1867, he wrote to Chernalé in Paris: "Le mieux que nous puissions faire, c'est de les [the Reform League] pousser en avant dans la voie de la revolution." In another letter, of 12 May, he assured the Parisians that 200,000 men were ready to come armed from the provinces to London.¹³ Also, the organ of the International in Switzerland wrote of the same delusion. "Après cette victoire le comité central ourra s'occuper de l'AIT."¹⁴

An increasingly important role in the General Council was played by a new member, Paul Lafargue, an émigré from Paris who took over the post of the secretary for Spain. His views evolved from those of "French Socialism" to Marxism. His new political loyalty was reinforced by ties of marriage to Marx's daughter, Laura. The new Polish secretary was Antoni Zabicki. The Italians disappeared altogether from the Council. On the whole, the General Council had not asserted itself in England, and its authority on the Continent was of a very limited nature.

While the British workers were admitted through franchise reform into the body politic and so were on the road toward fuller integration into the existing political system, in France the empire's flirtation with the working class was approaching its end. The French workers were alienated and intransigent. In the three years since the foundation of the International, its sections in France had made only limited progress.¹⁵ According to the report submitted to the Congress in 1867, the Paris organization had 600 members, but only half of the dues were paid, and this resulted in a deficit of 460 francs. Three months later, the Parisians informed London that their branch had only 300 members. Aubry's report about Rouen was full of complaints: "all the efforts which we have made so far to spread among the working classes of our parts the ideas of mutuality and

justice have been almost in vain. . . . Fear of the authorities and of unemployment is so strong that it impedes all personal initiative."¹⁶

In the spring of 1867, under the stimulus of a miners' strike in Fuveau near Marseilles, a section of the International was formed in this port city. The section saw as one of its tasks preventing Italian strike breakers, coming mainly from Piedmont, from entering France. Soon a section was also founded in Fuveau. The initiative to found a section in Algiers, the only organization of the International on the African continent, probably came from Marseilles. Founded in May 1867, the section in Algiers collapsed within a short time. Yet the ties between the two cities continued, and they resulted in an appeal launched in July 1868 by the section in Marseilles addressed to masons and urging them not to go to Algiers.

Twenty-seven branches of the International in France, including two in the colonies, in Algiers, and in Guadeloupe, are listed in the report of the General Council to the Lausanne congress in 1867. Yet nineteen out of the twenty-seven branches paid nothing to the treasury of the General Council. The Lyon organization paid £11.12sh. and Paris only £4. This financial and organizational weakness did not prevent the spread of the legend of the great resources at the disposal of the International, even at that early period. In the trial of the International in Paris, in May 1868, when it emerged that Varlin had refused the investigating judge access to membership lists and financial books, the president of the court drew the conclusion that the International had at its disposal "considerable sums," and that was bound to cause a state of anxiety.¹⁷

Despite the original antipathy of the French International toward strikes, the strike was used increasingly by workers in various trades and industries. Doubts about the antistrike principle became widespread and must have affected the leaders in Paris. The miners who went on strike in Fuveau were supported by Tolain, who had offered to put the *Courier Francais* at their disposal. That journal was edited by Vermorel and expressed the views of Tolain and his circle. The Paris bureau of the International issued an appeal to its members to support the striking miners.¹⁸ More decisive in their impact were two Parisian strikes: of bronze workers and of tailors. The "bronziers" strike started in February 1867 in one of the shops and then spread into other places. The employers answered with a lockout that affected 1,500 workers. The bronziers' society undertook to pay twenty francs weekly to every locked-out member. Within a few days the society's funds dropped from 35,000 francs to 20,000. The Parisians appealed to the trade unionists in England for a loan of 10,000 to 15,000 francs, equivalent to £400-500. They said that such a sum would assure the bronziers' victory, and they promised to repay by monthly installments.

The General Council started a campaign for aid, and delegates came from Paris to canvass for aid on their own. Their success was limited. The Ironfounders Society refused to help on the grounds of adverse circumstances. Its secretary, D. Guile, wrote to Jung that 2,000 of its members were out of work, and, therefore, the society could not do "what our feelings would wish us

to do." A similar refusal came from the Amalgamated Engineers Society.¹⁹ The total sum of financial aid from Britain was rather paltry. Some of the money was offered too late, some of what was promised never materialized. A long time after the Paris struggle was concluded, successfully, complaints were being made that the loaned sums had not been repaid.

Parisian tailors began their strike on 1 April 1867. Immediately help came from their London colleagues, led by Matthew Lawrence, an active member of the General Council. Lawrence and Druitt, the president of the Tailors' Society (coopted on this occasion to the General Council), went to Paris, bringing the Parisians a generous contribution of £200. They also assured the Parisians that no shop in London would work for any Parisian firm during the strike. Lawrence sought Marx's help to dissuade German workers from strikebreaking.²⁰ This strike ended with a compromise: the tailors received a 10 percent rise in pay, instead of the 20 percent they demanded. The imperial authorities colluded with the employers and attacked the strikers.

The imperial government, which had treated the International with a degree of tolerance in the past, became increasingly repressive. At the end of September 1866 a certain Jules Gottraux traveled from Geneva to London, carrying papers that the Swiss International wished to be transferred to the General Council. The French police searched his luggage and confiscated the papers. Gottraux, a Swiss by birth, had acquired British nationality and so was under the protection of the Crown. After the French ignored the request of the General Council, it appealed to the foreign secretary, Lord Stanley. He reacted most positively, and his intervention ended the matter with unexpected success: the French authorities included in the returned papers various other materials, for example, copies of the *Tribune du Peuple*, sent from Brussels to people in Paris who had never received them.²¹

After the defeat of the empire in Mexico, when the might and prestige of the empire seemed to be at their nadir, the Paris section of the International established a common front with the bourgeois Republicans. Members of the International participated in two demonstrations organized by the Republicans. The first took place on 2 November 1867 at the Montmartre cemetery at the grave of Manin, the Italian patriot. The second was a protest against the reoccupation of Rome by French troops. Following these events, the French police searched the homes of Tolain and of other members of the Paris section.²² In March 1868, leading members of the section were put on trial. They were treated by the public prosecutor and the presiding judge with touching courtesy. The prosecutor admitted that the accused were "ouvriers laborieux, honnêtes, intelligents," of unquestionable morality and honor. They were all found guilty and fined 100 francs each.²³

Soon, a new bureau of the Paris section was constituted. Varlin and Bourdon, the more radically tempered Parisian leaders, played a prominent role in it. The Proudhonist Fribourg complained later that the new bureau contained "une assez forte partie des communistes libéraux," which was a reflection of the changing

tendencies among Parisian workers.²⁴ The members of this bureau were also prosecuted. Ten of its members were tried on 22 May 1867, and they were all condemned to three months' imprisonment and fined 100 francs.

The International in Switzerland developed without the hindrances and persecutions found in France.²⁵ Becker and his *Vorbote* played an increasingly important role. The two Geneva sections collaborated in various enterprises. They ran a restaurant, a Sunday market, a brushmaking cooperative, and a health insurance scheme. They denounced the high prices of medicines and the profits made by the apothecaries.²⁶ Becker's organization was further strengthened when the all-Swiss congress of German workers' educational associations, held in August 1868 in Neuchâtel, declared their collective affiliation to the International. Yet, all this time Becker was being beset by personal, mainly financial, problems. Time and again he threatened to withdraw from public activity. For example, Becker wrote to Lessner in London, on 11 October 1867, that for the last three years he had been working for the International "without remuneration," causing sorrow and deprivation to his family. He also proposed to Liebknecht and Bebel in Germany that they take over the leadership of the Sektionsgruppe and the editorship of the *Vorbote*.²⁷ However, Becker remained at his post until the end.

At the beginning of 1868 the building workers in Geneva went on strike. This strike was more serious than any previous strike in the country. The 3,000 strikers demanded a shorter working day and an increase in wages. The International in Geneva launched appeals for help. Gaglia, a member of the Geneva committee, was sent to Paris and London. In France, Varlin collected the substantial sum of 10,000 francs. Little money, however, was collected in England. Some money was sent from Germany, though the contributions were of a symbolic nature. The striking building workers finally won: the working day was reduced from twelve to ten hours, and they received a 10 percent raise in wages. The bourgeois press in Switzerland and other countries noted the role played by the International and vilified it and its directing body in London. This helped to increase the popularity of the International among workers and stimulate the recruitment of new members.²⁸ Similarly, the Lausanne organization supported striking tailors in that city.

As in France and Switzerland, the membership of the International grew in Belgium. During 1866, mechanics, shoemakers, and cabinetmakers formed unions that became affiliated with the International. In April 1867 they formed, with the existing section in Brussels, a federation, headed by an administrative commission. Members of the commission were mostly artisans and skilled workers. Also the newly founded trade societies in Liège became affiliated to the International. During 1868 two other organizations, the Volksverband in Antwerp and Francs Ouvriers in Verviers, declared their adherence to the International. The leaders of the Brussels organization gradually changed their attitudes toward unions and strikes, despite the persistence of mutualist ideas. So the *Liberté*, the weekly paper edited by Fontaine, complained that the accept-

ance of strikes was contrary to "l'idée mutuelliste qui a inspiré si profondément les fondateurs de l'Association."²⁹ Paradoxically, a few weeks later Fontaine printed extracts from the Introduction to *Das Kapital*, praising Marx as the great German thinker.³⁰

Tailors went on strike in Belgium on 8 April 1867, only a week after the Paris tailors began their strike. Help came from other Belgian unions, but also from Paris and London. Three weeks later the strike ended with victory for the tailors, who received a 10 percent rise in wages. Employers who saw in these strikes the hand of the International were confirmed in their views by the International's press. The newly founded journal in Verviers informed the whole world that the International numbered not less than 1.3 million members who were ready to support the workers' cause "by all the means at their disposal."³¹

All these events pale in comparison to the greatest of battles in which the Belgian International took part. The miners of Damprémy, in the Charleroi Basin, went on strike in March 1868 when their employers cut their wages by 5 percent. The strike spread to other areas. The government used soldiers and policement in support of the employers. In one place ten people were killed and many were wounded. The miners finally succumbed. Only then did the Brussels organization of the International decide to intervene. A manifesto, written by Vésinier, was issued, but its high-flown style and content made it incomprehensible to those to whom it was addressed.³² A team of "missionaries" sent to the Charleroi Basin achieved greater success. Brismée and Hins were among these missionaries. Later, when twenty-two miners and their wives were tried in court, a team of barristers sent from Brussels defended them. All the accused were acquitted. The Charleroi Basin was soon covered by a network of sections of the International, which was the harbinger of even greater progress to come.

The most important extension of the International at that period was into Germany. The revival of the German workers' movement in the 1860s must be seen against the background of increasing struggle over the unification of Germany. In Prussia, the bourgeois Progress party promoted a movement toward uniting Germany on the basis of a parliamentary system, endowed with all the Liberal rights and institutions. In September 1862, Otto von Bismarck, the head of the Prussian Junker class, became the prime minister of Prussia, and he adopted a policy of repression against his Liberal opponents. Both Junker Conservatives and the bourgeois Liberals tried to draw the working class to their side. The Progress party weakened its hold over the working classes by opposing an electoral franchise to the Prussian Diet based on the principle of political equality. Therefore, the more active working-class circles rejected its patronage and aimed for political independence.

Ferdinand Lassalle, a veteran of the 1848 revolution, became their spokesman and leader. In May 1863, at a congress in Leipzig, the General German Workers League (Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein—ADAV) was founded and Lassalle was elected its president. He wrote its program, which included the principles of workers' cooperatives to be aided by the state and of universal

male franchise, seen as the means toward the economic and political liberation of the working class. Lassalle elaborated his ideas in pamphlets, articles, and numerous speeches at mass meetings.

Lassalle's denunciations of the Liberals for their opposition to a democratic franchise was not matched by attacks of similar vehemence directed against Bismarck and his regime. However, many activists of the nascent workers' movement opposed Bismarck, and they formed their own organization, the Association of German Workers Societies (Verband Deutscher Arbeitervereine—VDAV). They tended toward collaboration with anti-Prussian Liberals and radicals of various shades. While Lassalle's ADAV was identified in Germany as "Socialist" or even "Communist," their opponents were seen as part of the anti-Prussian "petit-bourgeois" camp. But matters changed. Though Lassalle supported Bismarck in his war against Denmark over Schleswig and Holstein, the Prussian authorities, disturbed by the growth of the ADAV, prosecuted the group. Lassalle was charged and sentenced to twelve months' imprisonment. Before his sentence was carried out Lassalle died, fatally shot in a romantic duel (31 August 1864).

The real power in the ADAV passed to one of Lassalle's most ambitious partisans, Johann Baptist von Schweitzer. He founded a journal entitled *Der Social-Demokrat*. The title displeased Engels who would have preferred a more class-defined name, for example, *Der Proletarier*.³³ One of Marx's closest friends and followers in exile in London was Wilhelm Liebknecht. He returned to Germany in 1863, and on Marx's advice enrolled in the VDAV. He became the coeditor of Schweitzer's paper, charged with all matters relating to the newly established International.

Marx and Engels agreed to contribute articles. In February 1865, *Der Social-Demokrat* printed Marx's long "Letter to the Editor," which contained a critical assessment of Proudhon, occasioned by the French thinker's recent death. The paper also published the address and the statutes written by Marx for the IWMA. Yet a conflict erupted when Marx tried to critique the body of Lassallean ideas. Schweitzer accused Marx of being ignorant of the circumstances in Germany and of undermining the "tradition" binding the ADAV together. Marx was also criticized by another of the Lassallean leaders, Bernhard Becker. In a brochure devoted to Lassalle, Becker admitted that the founder of the ADAV was not the "father of Socialist thought" in Germany; but neither was Marx. The title belonged to "our faithful brave Hess in Paris, from whom Marx had learned." Becker said that while Lassalle showed greatness of spirit, Marx exhibited "petty sarcasm and ridiculous ambition."³⁴

Liebknecht, loyal to Marx, left the *Social-Democrat*, thereby losing his only source of meager income. He concentrated on organizing workers for the International in Berlin, where he had settled. His activities were constantly frustrated by the Prussian police, who finally banned him from the capital. Liebknecht moved to Leipzig where he found a more congenial environment and many friends.

Rhineland was another area in which Marx tried to extend the influence of the International.³⁵ In Rhineland the memory of Engels, the leader of revolutionary democracy in the 1840s, and of his associate survived, and their early writings were still in circulation. Young men to whom Marx and Engels were legendary figures were ready to enter the ranks of their "party." Marx's leadership role in the International became an additional stimulus for these young men to join the organization. Rhineland was by no means a tabula rasa, as Becker, his German language group, and the *Vorbote* had done much of the groundwork there. Becker had friends and correspondents in Cologne, Solingen, Mainz, and in other places, but their enthusiasm for the cause of the International did not match his own.

Eventually, developments in the various parts of Germany increased the influence of the directing body in London in Germany. Most instrumental was the ever faithful Liebknecht, who entered into an effective partnership with a young Saxon worker, a turner by trade, August Bebel. The two took over the leadership of the VDAV, to which they tried to give a more pronounced Socialist character. Saxony became incorporated into the Prussian-dominated North-German League, the precursor of the German empire. In the ensuing elections to the league's parliament, both Bebel and Liebknecht, favored by the universal manhood suffrage, won seats.

Liebknecht gained another platform, having become the editor of a newly founded journal, *Demokratisches Wochenblatt*. He was careful not to give it the air of the International's mouthpiece, thinking that the political agitation against "Prussian Caesarism" must take precedence over social agitation. Yet the logic of events pushed Bebel and Liebknecht toward a more openly defined platform. The non-Socialist elements within the VDAV were weakening.

The congress of the VDAV was to be held in Nuremberg in September 1868. A branch in Dresden, led by Julius Vahlteich, proposed a motion that the congress declare its affiliation with the IWMA and its program. The motion also recommended that all the local societies transform themselves into sections of the International. This went much further than Bebel and Liebknecht would have wished.

In the meantime, Bebel and Liebknecht entered into sort of an alliance with Schweitzer, who had adopted a more principled policy and now opposed both Bismarck and those Liberals who became proponents of German unification under the aegis of Prussia. Schweitzer informed Liebknecht about his renewed relations with Marx. Schweitzer recognized Marx as the "most important scientific authority of our tendency."³⁶ It is evident that events in Germany improved Marx's standing with both wings of the labor movement. The growing interest in *Das Kapital*, which had just been published in Germany, and the polemics over it were contributing to Marx's standing.

The congress in Nuremberg was held from 5 to 7 September 1868, and it was attended by 115 delegates. Eccarius came as the representative of the General Council. The executive proposed that the congress declare the program of the

IWMA as its own. Yet, the paragraphs specifying that program were not taken from the text of the Marxian inaugural address, but were based on what Becker described in one of his articles. At the time, Marx described Becker's exposition as "das konfuse Wischiwaschi." The executive recommended that the congress declare its support for "the efforts of the IWMA." This meant, at best, apart from the acceptance of the general aims, some coordination of activities that would not impair the independence of the VDAV. This recommendation was accepted by a majority of sixty-nine to forty-six votes, the majority representing sixty-one societies and the minority thirty-two. The non-Socialist minority soon left the VDAV.

A little earlier, from 22 to 26 August, the Lassalleans held their congress in Hamburg. After a discussion of the "international character of the workers' movement," they decided that it was the duty of the "German workers party" to cooperate with workers' parties in "all lands of culture." Proposals to join the International and to attend its next congress, to be held in Brussels, were rejected. The transactions of both congresses gave evidence of the growing tendency towards a closer association with the wider international movement, without jeopardizing the independence of the national organizations.

Encounters: Lausanne and Brussels

The expansion of the International, its growth and spread, was expressed in the second and third congresses. The congresses mirrored the complexions and complexities of the components of the International and the areas of fierce debate. The keenness with which the General Council prepared for the first congress at Geneva was not matched in the snail-like pace of preparations for the next congress, to be convened in Lausanne in September 1867. Yet one matter that emerged in the weeks preceding the congress seriously disturbed the leading men in the London council. At the meeting of 2 July Jung reported that the center in Geneva was organizing another congress, that of "peace and freedom," to be convened in Geneva after the conclusion of the congress of the IWMA. The leaders in Geneva were going to appeal to the members of the International assembled in Lausanne to proceed from there to Geneva to participate in a congress devoted to another cause.

A new International was in the making. The movement embraced pacifists, Democrats, and radicals of all sorts in the various countries. Its leading lights in Britain were Edmond Beales and John Stuart Mill. The main promoter in Geneva was Becker, who, despite his many concerns, could spare enough energy to act on behalf of the new body and attempt to bring together the two movements, one working class and the other dominated by bourgeois elements.

Marx, who was absent from the meeting of 2 July, raised the matter on 13 August. He persuaded his colleagues in the council to instruct its delegates for Lausanne "not to take any official part in the Peace Congress." Marx justified his opposition to the "peace-at-any-price party" on the grounds that its adherents "would fain leave Russia alone in the possession of means to make war upon the

rest of Europe, while the very existence of such power as Russia was enough for all the other countries to keep their armies intact." Yet, Marx's main objections to middle-class pacifism were of a more fundamental nature. He believed that it was the union of the working classes in the countries of the world that would ultimately make wars impossible, and those who declined to help to bring about the transformation in the relations of labor and capital "ignored the very conditions of universal peace."

The congress in Lausanne began on Monday, 2 September and ended on Saturday the seventh.² Fifty delegates attended the opening, but the final official list numbered sixty-four. As in Geneva, the Swiss formed the largest contingent. Seventeen delegates were from France, but this time most of them came from the provinces. The Belgians sent only one delegate, César De Paepe. From Italy came two delegates, but neither of them represented any genuine section of the International. From London came Eccarius, Carter, Dupont, and Lessner. Germany was represented by five delegates. While the Swiss, French, and British delegates were mostly workers, not one German delegate was a true proletarian.

The opening of the Congress was marked by dissension. The chairman of the organizing committee, Marc Aviolat, asked in his opening speech for God's blessings. This led to protests from the atheist majority and to long wranglings with the local paper, *Gazette de Lausanne*.

The francophone element, as in the previous congress, was in a large majority. A commission framed a program of the proceedings. Two points formulated earlier by the General Council were accepted, though with additions and revisions. The first concerned practical means to be adopted in the struggle against capital, and the second point concerned the question of credits, banks, and money. The points added by the commission were: cooperation, machinery, strikes, hours of work, education—all addressed in the previous congress. At the insistence of the French delegates, a point on the definition and role of the state was included. The Geneva delegates proposed a discussion on political liberties. Another motion required the congress to formulate a collective address to the peace congress in Geneva, which went against the position of the General Council. The last point in the program was on the location of the General Council and the seat of the next congress. The very elaborate and demanding program was accepted unanimously. Commissions were elected to discuss particular matters and propose resolutions to the plenum of the congress. The procedure was different from that of the previous congress, where all matters were discussed and resolved only once, at plenary meetings.

The resolutions emerging from the first two commissions were permeated by Proudhonist ideology, despite the presence in the commissions of Marx's friends Eccarius, Becker, and Kugelmann. The aim of the International, the emancipation of the working class, was to be achieved through the creation of "productive institutions," the "cooperation of production," and, in particular, the founding of a "general credit association"; this would lead to the creation of a national bank that would distribute free credit to all people striving to achieve economic inde-

pendence. Also De Paepe, who brought with him from Brussels a long memorial on this question, proposed, as a means of emancipation, a bank of mutual credit and also the substitution of the existing monetary system by a system of checks.

At a plenary session, Eccarius subjected all these proposals to a sharp critique. "It seems," he said, "that we are at a meeting of German professors lost in clouds of abstraction." The practical question was how to use the 25 million pounds sterling, deposited by the English trade unionists, for the benefit of the working class. Eventually, Eccarius proposed a resolution of his own that reconciled the various views: the working class funds must be used to promote cooperation of production, and the institution of national credit and of cooperative banks. There was no opposition, and his motion was accepted unanimously.

One of the commissions was deliberating on the problem of the potential danger that was entailed in the growth of cooperation: the working class might be split into a class of relatively privileged cooperative producers, the "fourth estate," and the unprivileged rest, the "fifth estate." To overcome such a danger, the commission believed a more radical and definite revolution must be achieved. De Paepe, a leading member of that commission, spelled out the means of achieving such an aim: transformation of existing national banks, such as the Banque de France and the Bank of England, into "banks of free credit," the collectivization of land, the reform of inheritance laws, tax reform, and so on.

A storm ensued. Chémalé, Coullery, and Tolain vehemently attacked the idea of land collectivization. Tolain was in favor of collectivizing the means of transport and of mining property, but not land. De Paepe, accused of betraying the principles of mutualist Socialism in favor of Communism, insisted in his defense that he was still a "mutuelliste"; but he did not dread the term *Communism* ("Le mot du communisme ne me fait pas peur"). Eventually, Tolain proposed to remove from the motion the controversial words, and it was accepted by a large majority of twenty-seven to eleven. So began one of the greatest controversies in the history of the International.

The congress returned to the question of property, including land, when it discussed the definition and role of the state. The commission charged with this matter postulated that the state take over the means of transport and commerce in order to break the power of large companies and so harmonize collective and public interests. The commission also raised the question of the judiciary as part of the state. Trial by jury was advocated as a principle. However, the commission maintained that, in judging offenders, social conditions must be taken into account. The bad educational system was responsible for poverty and mental degradation, hence for crime, prisons, and the degradation of humanity.

Once again, De Paepe took the occasion to advocate the idea of collective ownership of land, so deeply ingrained in the tradition of Belgian Socialism. He was opposed by Longuet, a young French journalist. Longuet, who identified collectivization with nationalization, feared the growth of state power. He insisted that only individual property favored the development of human personal-

ity. Longuet was supported by Coullery, who declared himself a partisan of the most absolute liberty and, therefore, of individual property. He would accept collective property only in exceptional cases, such as transport and mining. He said that collective ownership of land would create a system such as the one prevailing in Turkey. Spreading collectivism would stunt the growth of human individuality. "I hope I shall die before that," he ended his moving speech. In turn De Paepe protested that the land in Turkey was not collective property, but it belonged to one individual, the sultan. This time, De Paepe was supported by a number of delegates: Eccarius, Stampa, Stumpf, Ladendorf, and Becker. It may be interesting to note that, with the exception of Stampa, they were all Germans. Finally, the question of property did not come to a vote, but was left for the next congress to consider.

Then, the matter of political liberties, raised by the Geneva representatives, came to the fore. They contended that lack of political liberties hampered the education of the people and the emancipation of the working class. Social emancipation of the workers was inseparable from their political emancipation. They urged the forthcoming peace congress to render assistance in winning for all nations the "unalienable rights of 1789." The motion was accepted by a majority, with two dissenting voices. The International had thus adopted the principle of active participation in politics, including elections and the struggle for a democratic franchise. The question was of acute concern for workers and their friends in Britain, France, Germany, Belgium, and Switzerland—in fact, in all the countries where the International was established. An opposite principle, that of "political abstentionism," was to emerge only in a later period.

The delegates spent relatively little time on questions directly affecting the life and welfare of the working class, such as shortening the hours of labor, the mechanization of production, and the question of strikes. The commission dealing with these matters expressed the view that machines would become beneficial only when, thanks to banks of mutual credit and workers' associations, they passed into the hands of the producers. Strikes were considered "brutal means," to be avoided if possible. The commission recommended to reaffirm the resolution passed at the Geneva congress: there must be mutual help in defense of wages, but the higher aim was the abolition of wage labor altogether.

Earlier, the congress had discussed the problem of its relationship with the forthcoming peace congress in Geneva. Dupont, the chairman of the congress, participated in the commission dealing with this matter, but he was unable, or perhaps unwilling, to refute the proposal of an address declaring the full and total participation of the International in that congress. If accepted by the plenum, it would have contravened the recommendations of the General Council. The discussion in the plenum revealed strong differences and disagreements. The main line of division was between those who advocated full participation in the peace movement on the grounds that its progress and achievements would help the cause of the working class, and those who held the view that it was the advance of the workers' cause and its victory that would lead to a firm, per-

petual, and universal peace and therefore the peace movement was irrelevant. Finally, an amendment proposed by Tolain and supported by De Paepe was accepted by a majority of thirty-two votes to fourteen. It considered the prime and principal cause of war to be pauperism and lack of economic equilibrium. The amendment stated that to eliminate wars, a just economic system must be established. Participation of members of the International in the peace congress was made conditional upon the acceptance by members of that congress of Tolain's amendment. This resolution, of a clear Proudhonist inspiration, was very distant from the stand of Marx and the council in London.

When the peace congress assembled, it contained a strong contingent of delegates who came directly from Lausanne. The discussions there revealed a diversity of view on every question, and they bore little fruit. The only tangible result of that congress was the foundation of a new international organization: the League of Peace and Freedom.

Proudhonist ideology and phraseology dominated the deliberations and resolutions of the congress in Lausanne to a greater degree than in Geneva the year before. However, the followers of Proudhon, who had died two years earlier, were divided on a most important point: the nature of property in the society of the future. In Lausanne, more so than in Geneva, the intellectuals in the International were active: Longuet, Chémalé, Coullery, De Paepe, and others. The German philosopher Ludwig Buechner gave a conference on the respective systems of Schulze-Delitzsch and Lassalle. Another conference was given by Eccarius on the economic theories of Karl Marx.

Marx, informed by Lessner about the proceedings of the Congress, reacted with anger. In a letter to Engels, he promised to go to the next congress and put an end to the antics of the "Proudhonist asses." He was consoled, however, by the fact that the "Parisian chatterboxes" had not prevented "our reelection." In the same letter, Marx gave a most optimistic summary of the progress of the International, stressing his own power and influence: "And at the next revolution, which perhaps is nearer than it seems, we have (that is, you and me) this powerful engine in our hands."³ Engels, writing to Marx, was unhappy about the congress being overrun by the French. He thought that this would change the next year at the congress to be held in Brussels. And he felt it was most important that the council remained in London.⁴

There was one member of the General Council, André Fox, who was scheming in favor of the council's removal from London. He wrote about it in a letter to Becker, dated 29 August 1867. Its contents were transmitted to Marx. Fox hoped that the removal of the seat of the council to the Continent would give him and other English members the opportunity to found sections and, eventually, a federation in Britain. He thought, however, that the post of American secretary, held by himself, should remain in London. This view led to serious friction between Marx and Fox.⁵

Surprisingly, another leader staked his claim to victory in Lausanne. Auguste Blanqui, who was not a member of the IWMA, wrote in one of his letters: "Our

ideas won completely in Lausanne, though none of us was present there to defend them." He was referring to the resolution about the danger of an emerging "fifth estate" that could arise from the progress of cooperation.⁶

A year later the third congress assembled in Brussels. The Belgian government threatened to suppress the International. The Brussels members of the International met this threat with defiance: the congress would take place and the doctrines of the International, that of justice in particular, would be preached in Brussels. The congress met without any hindrance.⁷ It lasted eight days, from the 6 to 13 September 1868, deliberating longer than the previous congresses. It also assembled a record number of delegates, nearly one hundred. From England came Eccarius, Shaw, Jung, Dupont, Lucraft, Cohn, and Lessner. A not quite legitimate mandate, that of the "reform league," was held by another Londoner, Cowell Stepney. The official list of delegates contains the names of five German delegates, but only two of them came directly from Germany. Included in the German delegation were Johann Philipp Becker, the Geneva leader; Buetter, also from Geneva, who had carried a mandate from the Workers' Educational Association in Nuremberg; and Moses Hess, the famous veteran of German Socialism, who came from Paris, carrying a mandate from Cologne. His name appeared a second time in the list of delegates as the representative of the Basel section. Hess had only recently been recruited by Becker into the IWMA, and it was also Becker who arranged his mandates. Only after the congress, having received the addresses of both sections, did Hess enter into correspondence with them.⁸ The two delegates who came from Germany were Klein from Solingen and Schepler from Mainz.

The Swiss contingent was made up of only eight delegates. The absence of Dupleix, Coullery, and Guillaume was notable, but a new delegate, Adolphe Catalan, made his appearance. He represented the Association du sou pour l'affranchissement de la pensée eu de l'individu. Italy was represented by a single delegate, Dupont, who carried a mandate from "workers societies in Naples." The mandate belonged originally to Doctor Saviero Friscia, who could not come on time. For the first time, there was a delegate from Spain, Sarro Magalan, representing the Legion Iberica de Trabajo, a workers' association in Catalonia. From France came Tolain, Murat, Aubry, Longuet, and fourteen other, less well-known, delegates. Varlin was absent, being imprisoned in Sainte Pélagie. The largest group of delegates was from Belgium—fifty-six members, which contrasted with no representation in Geneva and that of only De Paepe in Lausanne. Many Belgians came from the provinces, and two delegates came from Luxembourg. Leading among the Belgians were De Paepe, Brismée, and Hins.

The congress was chaired by Jung, with support from Dupont and Murat. Much time was spent on procedural matters and reports. French was, once again, the dominant language. Lessner complained to the General Council afterwards that the French-speaking delegates were noisy when speeches were made in English or German.⁹

The General Council had proposed a program, but it met with disfavor. The definitive program consisted of six points, of which five came from the Belgians and one from the Germans. The German's raised the issue of the attitude workers should take in the event of war between the powers. The question of a looming war, and wars in general, was pushed to the forefront. Tolain and De Paepe represented the most radical positions on this question. De Paepe distinguished between two ways to combat wars: a direct one was to refuse military service and any work for war purposes, and an indirect one was to solve the social question, which was the task of the International. Tolain argued that justice ought to rule the relations "between natural groups, peoples, nations and citizens." The congress was invited to protest with all its force against war, and sections of the IWMA were urged to use the pressure of public opinion to prevent war.

According to Becker, any European war, in particular a war between France and Germany, would be a civil war, and the only beneficiary would be Russia, whose "social state had not yet reached the level of modern civilisation." The final resolution accepted by the congress absorbed much of the stand taken by Tolain and De Paepe. Among the measures recommended to the workers, priority was given to the principle of cessation of work in case of war. The resolution ended with an appeal: "war of peoples against war!"

On the question of participating in the second peace congress, due to take place in Bern immediately after the conclusion of the congress of the International, the members took a more radical position than that of the year before. Members were allowed to participate, but in their private capacity only. The congress expressed the view that "the League of Peace has no reason to exist in the presence of the work of the International." The league members were invited to join the IWMA.

Passing to other matters, no member opposed, this time, the principles of union organization and strikes. The congress recommended the organization of resistance societies, societies of mutual aid, and unemployment funds. The discussion and the resolutions marked a departure from classical Proudhonism toward a semirevolutionary syndicalism, a tendency that was to crystallize fully at a later time.

The congress discussed at length two important topics: the influence of mechanization on the condition of the working class and shortening the hours of labor. The resolutions passed were more consonant with the views of Marx than those of Proudhon. But followers of the two masters came into open conflict over another question. Richard from Lyon and Fontaine from Brussels engaged in polemics as to the nature of the bank that would have to guarantee the "mutual credit system." The very idea of such credit was challenged, most daringly, by Moses Hess. Hess said that the whole idea was one of a small sect. Hess referred to Marx's sharp critique of Proudhon in his book, *Misère de la philosophie*, of some twenty years ago. His speech was interrupted by protests. The resolution that was finally adopted condemned the principle of interest and

profit arising from the possession of capital and called for struggle against "financial feudalism." The idea of an exchange bank, which would guarantee a "democratic and egalitarian credit," was recommended.

One matter, that of the education of the young, took more time than most other matters. It was the third time that the congress of the International had discussed it, and it was discussed at great length. Individuals and groups in the International were committed to the cause of reform of the educational system in the spirit of democracy and modern science. A report from Brussels postulated an "integral school," whose curriculum would include living languages, hygiene, history, and, above all, scientific and technical education. The Liège section represented the classical Proudhonist stand: it opposed a state system of education and the principal of free education. It said that the state could not afford to run a comprehensive system accessible to all. Schools could be founded and run by free and voluntary associations. Work by the young would be part of their education and would contribute toward meeting the financial cost of education.

The Geneva delegates came with a memorial from the recently affiliated Association du sou. It advocated a free and obligatory system of education run by the state, but not the state as presently constituted; the new state being "société elle même." What is more, they demanded "indemnité scolaire," which meant a system of grants to cover the cost of proper nourishment, lodging, clothing, etc., for young people in the schools. Tolain argued in the spirit of Proudhonian orthodoxy. Education should be free of both church and state and must be based on the recognition of the supreme role of the family. His colleague from Paris, Ansell, took up the cause of education for women. It was also Ansell who read the proposal of a resolution, presented by the commission, and it was accepted. It recognized the impossibility of founding within a short time a rational system of education. Sections of the International were urged to run public courses to educate working-class people. Shortening the hours of labor was recommended as an indispensable condition for the advancement of workers' education. The resolution in its practical approach contrasted with the highly theoretical written reports and oral pronouncements.

The question of property, so hotly debated in Lausanne, became the main area of debate in Brussels, and with far-reaching consequences. The two main antagonists were again De Paepe and Tolain, but while Tolain now lacked the support of Coullery, De Paepe was aided by most of the Belgian delegates and others. The land question was dealt with in two reports, one coming from Rouen and written by Aubry and the other from the pen of De Paepe himself. The first report, claiming to be based on "science sociale" and "science économique," wanted land to become "communal collective property," acquired through generous compensation to previous owners, paid over a period of twenty-five to thirty years. The land would be used by associations of producers, and they would come under the control of an administrative council composed of "delegates of all corporations." Also the building of roads, canals, railways, and

houses would be done by workers' associations, who would pay dues to communes for the lease of land.

The very long Brussels report by De Paepe took as its motto the Positivist command: "observer pour savoir, savoir pour prévoir et prévoir pour pouvoir." The progress of agriculture made necessary collective labor and mechanization, the full use of botanic physiology and chemistry, and also the institution of associations based on collective ownership of land. The report outlined three possible systems of organization: free and independent producers' associations, national or even international federations of producers, and vesting the property in the "whole society, the nation and the federation of nations." In this third case, the producers' associations would retain the right of the simple use of the soil, either paying a rent, as suggested by the Belgians De Colins and De Potter, or without any payment, as advocated by some Americans and the Russians Herzen and Bakunin. The Belgian idea seemed to be more reasonable on the grounds that rent would become an instrument of equality to compensate for differences of fertility and topography.

Arguing against collectivism, Tolain pleaded for individual property as the extension of "I" (moi) because he felt collective property meant the diminution of the individual. Fontaine thought that collective property must lead to Communism, which he called the "religion of poverty." The Brussels delegate Coulon defended Communism. He said that it was misjudged on the basis of absurd rules invented by some "chefs d'école." These rules did not reflect the essence of Communist principles. The two Londoners, Eccarius and Lessner, spoke in defense of the idea of collective property. They saw no difficulty in Britain of taking land into the public domain, though obstacles would arise in Germany and France where small-scale agriculture predominated. The German peasants would oppose a revolution and bring ruin, said Eccarius. The French small farmers were blinded by the selfish consideration of their narrow interests, said Lessner.

There was an extraordinary aura during that debate—shouts, interruptions, and even uproar. This question, more than any other, roused the minds and hearts of the delegates. Finally, almost in the last hour, the Parisian Murat, speaking in the name of the relevant commission, proposed a set of resolutions: quarries, mines, and railways would be transferred to the "social collectivity" represented by the state, but a state "regenerated and subjected to the law of justice." The state would concede the use of quarries, mines, and railways to workers' corporations. Economic development and the progress of science would make large-scale and mechanized agriculture a "social necessity" and, therefore, the rules that would be applied to quarries, mines, and railways must also apply to arable land, which must be taken into the public domain and be used by agricultural corporations. These principles would also be extended to forests, canals, roads, and telegraph lines.

Of the forty-nine delegates present, thirty voted for the proposal, four were against, and fifteen abstained. It was a triumph of the collectivist principle and a

personal success for De Paepe. There were protests at the congress and after it. The opponents refused to take responsibility for the resolution, but they were prevented from further advocacy of their views at the congress. They protested outside of the congress and after its closure. Coullery denounced the resolution as Communism and the negation of individual property. "It was the school of Colins that won," he wrote. Colins put the state above individual freedom and the rights of man. He conceived the state "as a Russian or as a Turk."¹⁰

Nobody associated the turn taken in Brussels with Karl Marx. *Marxism* was still an unknown term. Marx's earlier writings were unknown or forgotten. The congress did hear, however, about Marx's new work, the first volume of *Das Kapital*. The German delegates referred to it in a resolution presented to the congress as "the most beautiful plea of science on behalf of the emancipation of the working class which the German Socialist school has so far produced."¹¹ Although the resolution recommended only Marx's work to the congress and no vote was taken on it, Becker in his report on the congress changed the words "We German delegates . . . recommend" to "the Congress recommends," and this has led to constant misrepresentations.¹²

Neither Marx nor Engels paid much attention to the important debates and resolutions of the Brussels congress, at which ownership of property and organization of the society of the future were so hotly discussed and so vividly designed. They noted, however, with satisfaction that London was, once again, confirmed as the seat of the General Council. The only resolution of which Marx was critical was the call to strike against war, in which he saw a "Belgian idiocy." He was also angry with Eccarius for omitting in his report of the congress written for *The Times* Becker's adverse references to Russia.¹³

The resolution concerning the attitude of the International toward the peace congress met with the disapproval of Nikolai Bakunin, a member of the Peace and Freedom League's Central Committee and also a recent member of the organization of the International in Geneva. Yet he soon led a secession of Socialist sympathizers from the league with far-reaching consequences.

Most curiously, some leaders of the International in Paris, just imprisoned in Sainte Pélagie, also protested against this resolution. They did so in the name of liberty, which they said did not restrict the right to express the aspirations of an epoch to any single association.¹⁴

The High Tide

After the Brussels congress the International made rapid progress. The sharpening of tensions within particular countries and internationally created a climate in which organizations of the International thrived. Radicalization, in thought and action, continued, reaching its utmost limits. Yet, the central authority in London had only a small influence on these developments. Of the veterans on the council, André Fox left Britain in September 1869 and settled in Vienna. In a letter to Becker Fox, a most prominent Polonophile, he wrote: "I do good here among the German-Austrians for the Polish cause."¹ He soon died there. Robert Shaw, another hardworking member of the council, also died at about that time.

A new partisan of Marx joined the council in October 1869, Auguste Serrailier. Robert Applegarth, the secretary of Carpenters and Joiners and a member of the London Trades Council, became active again in the council, making up for the loss of trade-union leaders on the council in the past. Eccarius carried on as the general secretary. Stepney was treasurer until he retired in April 1870. Having changed its quarters four times, the council settled in the rooms of the National Sunday League, 256 High Holborn, in the heart of London. The payment of rent and other financial obligations, though small, were of constant concern. In May 1869, the rent was £5 in arrears and the total debts of August of that year were £17. Therefore, the constant demands from Continental sections, trade associations, and strike committees for financial help from London were evidence of their ignorance of the true situation.

The British contingent within the General Council grew substantially through the cooption of a number of members of the affiliated "O'Brienite" National Reform League. That organization, founded by the well-known leader of Chart-

personal success for De Paepe. There were protests at the congress and after it. The opponents refused to take responsibility for the resolution, but they were prevented from further advocacy of their views at the congress. They protested outside of the congress and after its closure. Coullery denounced the resolution as Communism and the negation of individual property. "It was the school of Colins that won," he wrote. Colins put the state above individual freedom and the rights of man. He conceived the state "as a Russian or as a Turk."¹⁰

Nobody associated the turn taken in Brussels with Karl Marx. *Marxism* was still an unknown term. Marx's earlier writings were unknown or forgotten. The congress did hear, however, about Marx's new work, the first volume of *Das Kapital*. The German delegates referred to it in a resolution presented to the congress as "the most beautiful plea of science on behalf of the emancipation of the working class which the German Socialist school has so far produced."¹¹ Although the resolution recommended only Marx's work to the congress and no vote was taken on it, Becker in his report on the congress changed the words "We German delegates . . . recommend" to "the Congress recommends," and this has led to constant misrepresentations.¹²

Neither Marx nor Engels paid much attention to the important debates and resolutions of the Brussels congress, at which ownership of property and organization of the society of the future were so hotly discussed and so vividly designed. They noted, however, with satisfaction that London was, once again, confirmed as the seat of the General Council. The only resolution of which Marx was critical was the call to strike against war, in which he saw a "Belgian idiocy." He was also angry with Eccarius for omitting in his report of the congress written for *The Times* Becker's adverse references to Russia.¹³

The resolution concerning the attitude of the International toward the peace congress met with the disapproval of Nikolai Bakunin, a member of the Peace and Freedom League's Central Committee and also a recent member of the organization of the International in Geneva. Yet he soon led a secession of Socialist sympathizers from the league with far-reaching consequences.

Most curiously, some leaders of the International in Paris, just imprisoned in Sainte Pélagie, also protested against this resolution. They did so in the name of liberty, which they said did not restrict the right to express the aspirations of an epoch to any single association.¹⁴

The High Tide

After the Brussels congress the International made rapid progress. The sharpening of tensions within particular countries and internationally created a climate in which organizations of the International thrived. Radicalization, in thought and action, continued, reaching its utmost limits. Yet, the central authority in London had only a small influence on these developments. Of the veterans on the council, André Fox left Britain in September 1869 and settled in Vienna. In a letter to Becker Fox, a most prominent Polonophile, he wrote: "I do good here among the German-Austrians for the Polish cause."¹ He soon died there. Robert Shaw, another hardworking member of the council, also died at about that time.

A new partisan of Marx joined the council in October 1869, Auguste Serrailier. Robert Applegarth, the secretary of Carpenters and Joiners and a member of the London Trades Council, became active again in the council, making up for the loss of trade-union leaders on the council in the past. Eccarius carried on as the general secretary. Stepney was treasurer until he retired in April 1870. Having changed its quarters four times, the council settled in the rooms of the National Sunday League, 256 High Holborn, in the heart of London. The payment of rent and other financial obligations, though small, were of constant concern. In May 1869, the rent was £5 in arrears and the total debts of August of that year were £17. Therefore, the constant demands from Continental sections, trade associations, and strike committees for financial help from London were evidence of their ignorance of the true situation.

The British contingent within the General Council grew substantially through the cooption of a number of members of the affiliated "O'Brienite" National Reform League. That organization, founded by the well-known leader of Chart-

ism, Bronterre O'Brien, in 1850, saw public ownership of land and banks as the panacea for the ills of society. O'Brien, who died in 1864, had been engrossed in Irish affairs, and Ireland was close to the hearts of his comrades and successors. They hoped to enter into the wider European arena by affiliating to the International. By 1869 five O'Brienites were members of the General Council: George Milner, Martin James Boon, George Harris, William Townsend, and Charles Murray. Marx saw them as useful allies, although he regarded their ideas as a variety of Utopian Socialism. He appreciated their opposition to any dealings with the Liberals. Some counterbalance to them was provided by the cooption of Thomas Mottershead, a weaver, known for his anti-Irish views, who until then had been prominent in the Reform League.

Problems in Ireland had concerned the International before, in 1867. There was renewed agitation in 1869 for an amnesty to be granted to Irish political prisoners. Marx, who opened the debate on 16 November, strongly attacked Gladstone, the prime minister of the day, for refusing to consider an amnesty. In one respect, Marx said, the British government treated the English and the Irish alike: "there is no country in Europe where political prisoners are treated as they are in England and Russia." Eventually, Marx proposed a resolution condemning Gladstone, who in his reply to Irish demands "has deliberately insulted the Irish nation." Marx's proposal expressed admiration for the spirited manner in which the Irish people carried out their amnesty movement.

Marx's resolution was discussed at two successive meetings. Odger, who still occasionally participated in the General Council, opposed not the contents of the resolution but the impolitic words used by Marx. He also defended Gladstone's record. Odger was joined by Mottershead. Odger regretted that "Englishmen applauded the statements of Dr. Marx. . . . Ireland cannot be independent. It lies between England and France; if we relinquish our hold, it would only be asking for the French to walk in." He said that the Irish movement was not of the high-minded character that Marx ascribed to it. Marx, supported by Eccarius, Jung, Milner, and others, stuck to his guns, but he finally agreed to cross out the word *deliberately* in reference to Gladstone, which persuaded Odger and other critics to vote for the resolution. It was carried unanimously.²

Although the *Beehive* refused to report on these discussions and on the resolution, a much more widely circulated paper, *Reynolds Newspaper*, printed them on its front page. This raised Marx's hope of achieving greater influence within the British working-class movement and drawing it away from the Liberal party.

Germany increasingly became a matter of interest to the General Council. Liebknecht was giving the council exaggerated figures of potential members of the International in Germany, 50,000 and then 100,000.³ At a meeting in Leipzig he estimated the number of organized workers, including trade societies, to be 30,000.⁴ Similarly exaggerated numbers were given, a year later, by Becker. He informed the readers of his journal that a vanguard of 48,000 workers was taking part in the VDAV congress in Eisenach in August 1869.⁵

The true gains of the International were much more modest. Two miners from Lugau in Saxony, Jungnickel and Bachmann, informed Marx of their own and other miners desire to join the International. Though Lugau was in the electoral district in which Liebknecht was elected to the North-German Parliament, they learned about the International from other sources, in particular from a book by Wilhelm Eichhoff that had appeared recently in Berlin. It contained a detailed and favorable account of the organization, principles, and activities of the IWMA. Eventually, Jungnickel and Bachmann decided to become members and sent to London one taler for the cards. "These brave Lugau miners," Marx informed Engels, "are the first in Germany to enter into direct liaison with us and we must publicly support them."⁶

A majority of the members of the Lassallean ADAV, led by Bremer and Bracke, were willing to unite forces with Bebel and Liebknecht in order to form a new "Social Democratic party." They were opposed by Schweitzer and his partisans, but the process of unification could not be prevented. Liebknecht was triumphant. He informed Marx, in a letter dated 29 June 1869, that three-quarters of the ADAV already adhered "to us." He asked Marx to come in person to the unity congress and so "show yourself to German workers." He asked for membership cards for the envisaged mass recruitment. He also made the request that the *Communist Manifesto* be rewritten, so as to make it useful for recruiting members. Liebknecht said that the word *Communist* must be omitted, not only out of regard for foes but mainly out of regard for friends. Liebknecht tried to convey to Marx how that cherished term had become discredited, even among the working people.⁷ Although Marx was incensed by Liebknecht's suggestion, he still accepted that it was possible to "trim" the *Manifesto* as soon as the resolutions of the forthcoming congress were known.⁸

That there was some renewed interest in the *Manifesto*, but also much confusion about it, is illustrated by the following anecdote. Carl Boruttau, a medical doctor by profession and also editor of a small journal, *Volksfreund*, published in Leipzig, sent a letter to Becker in Geneva in which he complained that the "Communist Manifesto, published by our party leaders had been forgotten." Believing that Becker was one of its authors, he suggested the publication of a new edition.⁹

A congress to unite the ADAV and Liebknecht's followers assembled in Eisenach on 7 September 1869. Delegates came from various parts of Germany and also from Austria and Switzerland. Schweitzer's followers, who came in some force, were excluded. In a key speech Bebel outlined the proposals for a program and rules for the united organization, which he boldly called the Social Democratic party. The party will have no leader [keinen Fuehrer], he said, as the belief in authority, blind obedience, and the cult of personality were nondemocratic. In place of one leader there should be a collective leadership of five.¹⁰ The adoption of such a principle was directed against the tradition of one leader instituted by Lassalle and guarded by Schweitzer. It injected into a new

party a streak of antiauthoritarianism that was not necessarily to the liking of Marx and Engels.

The new organisation refused to join the International in any formal sense because under the existing legislation it would open itself to prosecution. Members were asked to join the IWMA on an individual basis.¹¹ In his speech on the last day of the congress Bebel put forward another consideration: the Social Democratic party must first constitute itself on a national basis because an international organization without a national organization was nothing but a shadow.¹² Bebel's recommendations were adopted and a commission was chosen to deal with details of the relationship between the new party and the International.

The delegates at Eisenach believed they were adopting a program based on the basic documents of the IWMA, but in fact their program absorbed much of the watered-down version produced by Becker in his *Vorbote*, which had been the case already a year earlier in Nuremberg. It proclaimed at its beginning that the aim of the party was the establishment of a free people's state, a Lassallean concept. The program recognized that the political liberty and economic emancipation of the working class were inseparable and that the social question could find its solution only in a democratic state. Nine out of the ten immediate demands of the new party were of a general democratic nature. Only the last point had a Socialist sound: state support for cooperation and state credit for cooperatives "under democratic guarantees." This, too, was taken from Lassalle's, and not Marx's, armoury.

In two other domains of the International, France and Belgium, events ran along parallel lines. The repressions in France pushed the movement toward resistance societies and syndical chambers, the types of organization tolerated by the government. This was in line with the continuing trend of departure from classical Proudhonism toward militant syndicalism. The movement was dominated by men representing the new tendencies: Varlin, Malon, and Combault. They were joined by Paul Lafargue, who in the course of 1869 moved from London to Paris. There he provided the unofficial link with the London headquarters and acted as a missionary of the "Marx party." He sought rapprochement with the Blanquists.¹³

The official correspondents with London were Murat, Malon, and Varlin. The bookbinders' union was still openly a section of the International, thus defying the authorities. Varlin was the recognized national leader and enjoyed increasing international prestige. He was in continuous correspondence with provincial centers and with various organizations and leaders in Belgium, Switzerland, and Germany. He was treading more firmly in the field of politics. More than anyone else, Varlin was capable of articulating the ideas of the radicalized movement that was variously described as "Socialisme collectiviste," "Communisme libéral," "Communisme anti-autoritaire," and "Socialisme révolutionnaire." The acceptance of these names by Varlin and his friends was brave indeed.

In the elections to the Legislative Corps, due to take place in Spring 1869, the Paris Internationalists initiated their own list of candidates and program. They competed with governmental candidates and the bourgeois-Liberal opposition. They also had to overcome the internal opposition of the abstentionists, whom Varlin called "Proudhonies enragés." The program contained points similar to those of the radical and Liberal opposition: the abolition of standing armies, the separation of state and church, free universal education, freedom of the press, and freedom of assembly and organization. It included, however, demands that lent it originality and independence: the expropriation of financial societies, the nationalization of banks, and the nationalization of public transport. None of the workers' candidates succeeded in the election, an outcome experienced by the British workers' candidates only a few months earlier.

The electoral program had by no means given expression to any wider vision of society, a vision that animated the most militant sections of the movement. One of Varlin's letters to Hins expressed with great clarity a plan for the future society. Varlin visualized a "representation of corporations" that would include all trades and professions. Alongside it another body would be founded: the representation of local and regional interests. The two representations would form the executive power in charge of all economic and social affairs, in particular those of production and exchange. The legislative power would lie directly in the hands of the people. All these institutions would form together the organization of labor which, in Varlin's eyes, was the first aim of the coming revolution, if the workers were not to be robbed of the fruits of the revolution.¹⁴

Varlin's closest comrade-in-arms was Malon. Like Varlin, he was a "collectiviste," an opponent both of mutualism and of "authoritarian Communism." He defined his collectivism as follows: "communisme débarrassé de son vieux bagage autoritaire et imprégné des idées nouvelles sur l'inviolabilité et respect de la personne humaine."¹⁵

In Autumn 1869, Varlin began publishing his own paper, *Le Travail*, but its publication ceased after a short time. In 1869 another journal appeared, *Voix du Peuple*, which was the last refuge of "pure" Proudhonists. Their most active member was Murat, but even he was abandoning the old positions. Murat, half-converted to the idea of collective property, still denounced Communism and collectivism, between which he made no distinction. They made "an abstraction of man, his nature, his temperament, his tendencies, his rights." However, Guillaume considered Murat to be one of the collectivists who mistakenly confused collectivism with the doctrine of authoritarian Communism.¹⁶ In fact, the doctrinal differences among the French Internationalists, though not vanishing, were weakening.

In December 1869, Henri Rochefort, an aristocrat turned revolutionary, founded the journal *Marseillaise*, which he opened to the working-class leaders. Varlin's hopes rose high. Propaganda through the press, he thought, in addition to meetings and the organization of workers' societies, would make it certain

that if the revolution breaks out, its leadership would not pass into the hands of non-Socialist Republicans. He saw Republicans and Liberals of all sorts as the main enemies.¹⁷

In this atmosphere the International flourished. Old sections were reestablished and new ones were founded. Trade societies were affiliated. In the capital, sections formed rooted in the particular quarters and also in intellectual or study circles. At the beginning of 1870, a "German section" was founded, headed by the Hungarian goldsmith, Léo Frankel. On 18 April the Paris sections united into a federation. The revival of the International also affected the provinces. Aubry in Rouen and Bastélica in Marseilles led the growing numbers of members and sympathizers. In both regions sections united into federations. Lyon retained its priority as the major provincial center. The standing of the International there was boosted by the International's involvement in a strike of thousands of ovalistes [domestic silkwinders], who were mainly women who lived on the outskirts of Lyon and in the surrounding villages. They were helped to organize by members of the Lyon organization, which also collected funds in aid of the strikers. One of the sections undertook teaching the women to read and write.¹⁸ A delegate to the Basel congress from Lyon, Palix, gave a vivid description of the silkwinding industry. Girls as young as the age of nine were employed, and the working day was seventeen hours and more, reduced, eventually, by the strike. Only 40 out of the 1,000 women could read or write. The number of these women was included in the report of membership of the Lyon organization, submitted to the Congress; the number was 10,000.

A conference was called for 13 March 1870 in Lyon with the aim of establishing a regional confederation. Guests were invited from other parts of France and from abroad. Varlin came from Paris, and he was honored with the chairmanship of the conference. He argued persuasively against political abstentionism.

The government, the press, and the judicial prosecutors pointed to the sinister hand in London as the prime mover of the ovalistes' strike, the strike of miners in Saint Etienne, the textile strike in the north, and other strikes. At the end of April and in the first days of May the police arrested a large number of activists in Paris and the provinces. Somehow, Lafargue escaped these arrests, and so he became the General Council's "special correspondent" for Paris. Varlin escaped to Belgium.

At the trial, representatives of the moderate and the revolutionary views sat together on the benches of the accused. Alongside known leaders sat men who had only loose connections with the International or none at all—a reflection of the faulty intelligence of the authorities. The main thrust of the prosecution was that the accused were members of a secret society. The International, with its London headquarters, had to be shown as a sinister power that disposed of enormous riches. The prosecutor produced in court the exact number of members, 433,785, taken from a brochure written by a member of the International in Lyon, Albert Richard. That picture of the International pleased the accused and their defense lawyers. One of them, Laurier, gave even higher figures: the Inter-

national had 700,000 members, of which 600,000 were in France.¹⁹ When the prosecuting attorney spoke of the "enormous riches" of the International, Laurier said: "Oui, ils ont des fonds, mais vous le savez, il n'y'a personne au monde pour donner comme les pauvres. Si vous voulez faire des millions, entendez bien: avec l'Internationale vous n'aurez qu'à frapper du pied et les millions sortiront de terre."²⁰ The quotation of these large numbers of members and funds might have damaged the accused, but was meant as good for the cause. A contemporary French historian, Rougerie, estimates that the membership of the International in France had never reached more than "quelques dizaines des milliers."²¹ One of the accused, Paul Robin, testified that for the workers the International was "comme un messie" and that in conflicts with employers they cried out: "Ah, quand l'Internationale viendra."

The trial ended in July. Of the accused, seven were sentenced to one year's imprisonment and twenty-seven to two months' imprisonment. Seven were found not guilty. When in September of that year the empire collapsed, all the prisoners were freed and welcomed by the masses as heroes. They soon had to face more dramatic trials, under conditions of war and a real workers' revolution.

The organization of the International in Belgium was developing in the same direction and with a force similar to that in France, although with notable differences. Starting in summer 1868, national congresses assembled twice a year. The second congress, held on Christmas day that year, brought into being a national organization with its own statutes and a "General Council," located in Brussels, as the leading authority. At the end of 1868, sections existed in sixty-six localities. In certain areas sections formed federations. Fifty delegates took part in the congress of June 1870, each representing a section. The authority in Brussels should have given more exact statistics of membership, in particular as dues of 20 centimes per member had to be paid to its treasury yearly, but neither membership nor financial statistics were available. Yet in Belgium, as elsewhere, exaggerated figures of membership and the wealth of the International came from friends and foes alike. The Francs-Ouvriers in Verviers, who constituted a section of the International, declared in a proclamation that the IWMA had 1 million members all over the world, "without differences of colour, skin and nationality"; that militant army faced 5 to 6 million soldiers in addition to 1 million policemen, all ranged against the International.²²

One incident gave rise to a strong and persistent belief about the treasures of the Belgian International. Coudroy, a miners' leader in the Charleroi Basin, who fell out with the organization, told the police on 26 April 1869 that the International had 300,000 members in the whole of the country, each paying 20 cents annually. The total income of 60,000 francs was divided among some twenty-five or thirty leaders under various pretexts. Coudroy said that the coffers of the International should contain at the least 80,000 francs, but he was ignorant about their location. When, eventually, the Brussels police discovered a large case in the rooms of the council, they found in it coal to fuel the stove.

Despite all the handicaps, the International in Belgium, as in France, entered a period of genuine progress and growing popularity. It was no longer a narrow group of men disputing over principles and doctrines. The sections established in the mining and industrial areas were well rooted in the mass of workers, and the daily life and toil of these workers were of constant concern to the International. The workers' condition, their organization, and their struggles were at the center of discussions in meetings and congresses. They were the main subject matter in the columns of the few journals, small in size, but full of vitality and interest, that stood at the service of the International.

In April 1869, once again, police and soldiers clashed with strikers, this time in Seraing near Liège, and many workers were killed and wounded. An emissary of the striking metal workers came to the headquarters of the International in Brussels to plead for help. Hins went to Seraing, where he tried to calm the tempers of the workers. The Brussels council, in an address to the strikers and to the miners of the area, who considered joining the strike, appealed to their prudence and warned that a wider strike action was bound to end in defeat. The miners struck, nevertheless, and new clashes and massacres resulted, mainly in the mining area of Borinage. A rain of abuse fell on the International. The parliament, the press, and the church condemned the International. However, the Catholic party tried to exploit these events against the ruling Liberals. The International cursed both parties of the higher classes. The official parties, they said, were not concerned with the welfare of the people or with any principles, but with "their pieces of hundred sous."²³

Hins, together with other members of the International, was investigated and arrested. Facing the prosecuting judge, Brismée denied that the International was a revolutionary organization: it aimed at a "new order of things," which by peaceful means would replace the existing system of exploitation. De Paepe, examined by the judge, refused to answer questions regarding his views, yet he declared himself to be a follower of "the Positivist school of Auguste Comte, of Proudhon and of the German Socialist Karl Marx." After one month's imprisonment the Belgian leaders were freed. The London General Council issued an address "to the workmen of Europe and the United States" on the events in Belgium. It was circulated in the form of a leaflet and also printed in the press, in various languages. Its author was, predictably, Karl Marx.²⁴

Recent events and the new spirit in the International inspired members of the International and workers under their influence to lose interest in democratic electoral reform, still preached as a panacea by bourgeois radicals. A new idea was gaining currency: the workers must elect their own Parliament, or anti-Parliament, and so constitute, as their highest authority, the representation of labor. Trade societies and sections of the International would form the nuclei of the new society.

Members of the Belgian International found the concepts of Proudhon and of Colins, until now predominant, insufficient and wanted to replace them with new ones, conforming to the spirit of time. These new ideas did not stem,

however, from Marx. De Paepe, who received a copy of *Das Kapital* from its author, promised to study it, despite his poor knowledge of German.²⁵ But even those who knew the language would have had great difficulty in absorbing that work, unless they were sufficiently versed in Hegelian dialectics. Yet the Belgian leaders and Marx agreed on important points. De Paepe and his friends were revolutionaries, but opponents of adventurous coups. In a short time, wrote De Paepe in one of his letters, the working class in Belgium will be fully organized. Should other workers proceed in the same direction, a danger would arise: the advocates of a "formal Republic" would try to use them for their own purposes.²⁶ It was the same warning Varlin had given in France. On the question of property, the Belgians went beyond the most radical resolutions of the IWMA congresses. They were in favor of extending the domain of public property to include capital assets and, in particular, to include "capitals accumulated in past generations."²⁷ In their concern with workers' self-organization and self-government, the Belgian International was closer to the French adherents of revolutionary collectivism than to any other group. Their independent views came to light fully in the great ideological and political struggles that soon were to dominate the International.

The International in Switzerland also entered a phase full of dramatic conflict, in which issues of local, national, and international dimensions were interwoven. The Basel organization, modest so far, rose to prominence during 1868. It consisted of a central section, two suburban sections, and eight trade societies. Its total membership, in September 1868, was 1,200. Soon, sections of women and new suburban and trade sections were founded, but, at the same time, some old sections were disintegrating. The lawyer Casper Aloys Bruhin edited a journal, *Der Demokrat*, which he put at the disposal of the International. This journal was soon replaced by a direct journal of the International in Basel, *Der Arbeiter*, which, however, had to close after a short time. The organization was marked by much squabbling, quarreling, and intrigues. Yet the prestige of the International rose when its president, Joseph Heinrich Frey, was elected to the Great Council of Basel, albeit from a bourgeois radical list.

Late in 1868, the Basel organization became involved in the fierce struggle between workers and employers in the lacemaking industry. The workers demanded pay increases, shorter working hours, and the acceptance of workers' committees in each enterprise. Tempers rose high and the International was unsuccessful in directing the movement into peaceful channels. Despite its efforts, the International became the butt of attacks by the employers and the city government. An anonymous letter informed the burgomaster that 10,000 men and 3,500 women were organized in the Basel sections. "They are supported by a rich Jew in London whom they call the Messiah."²⁸

Eventually, the lacemakers' and others' disputes were resolved by a compromise. In the coming period, some members left Basel and settled in other parts of Switzerland and abroad. Many lost interest and the motivation to stay within the organization. Finally, Frey himself left the International. Starke,

Frey's antagonist, denounced him in a letter to Hess, dated 26 March 1869, as a faint-hearted and weak man who left the organization when a profitable post was offered to him.²⁹

The leadership in the much diminished organization was taken over by Bruhin. He tried to turn it into party-electoral machinery, but he was unsuccessful. Bruhin still participated in the congress of the International in Basel in September 1869, but soon afterwards he left the organization.

Many strikes occurred in Basel, Geneva, and Lausanne in the course of 1869. The increase in strikes was to some extent fueled by the constantly growing belief of workers, shared by employers, that the headquarters in London had great funds. At its meeting on 16 February 1869, the General Council was informed by Applegarth that he was visited by an agent of Zurich manufacturers who tried to assess how far Swiss workers were under the direction of London. The agent tried to persuade Applegarth that Swiss employers, who had to import all their raw materials, could not afford to pay the wages demanded by the workers. He said that damaging manufacture would spell the ruin of the whole country, as agriculture on its own could not support the population of Switzerland. These views were refuted at the meeting by Marx and Jung.³⁰

In January 1869 a new *Fédération Romande* came into existence at the congress of sections in the French-speaking parts of Switzerland. François Brosset, a locksmith, became the chairman, and Henri Perret, an engraver, the secretary of the federation's committee. The federation included forty-seven sections, of which twenty-six were in Geneva. The Geneva sections were reported to number as many as 4,000 members, of which some 500 belonged to the *fabrique* category, while the rest, except a few nonworkers, were unqualified or semi-qualified laboring men. A mass of immigrants from other cantons and from abroad was included in the second category. Naturally, the *fabriques*, mostly citizens of Geneva, were interested in cantonal and national politics more than the rest. Among the foreigners, the International attracted to its ranks students, intellectuals, and men of no fixed occupation, as well as political *émigrés*, and those who were on the extreme fringes of revolutionary and national-liberation movements. They infused the Swiss International with new concepts and ideas, and they opened political horizons so far beyond the national scene that it was bound to lead to avalanches of almost global proportions.

Bakunin in the International

One of the most prominent political émigrés in Switzerland was Mikhail Bakunin. He appeared on the European scene in the 1840s. An aristocrat by birth, he abandoned a court career in his native Russia and in 1841 set out on a journey through Europe. In Paris he met Proudhon, whose libertarian ideas impressed him. In March 1844, in the same city, he encountered the young German democrat and philosopher, Karl Marx. Four years later, he fought on the barricades of the revolution in Prague (June 1848) and Dresden (May 1849). Arrested and tried both in Saxon and Austrian courts, he was eventually delivered into the hands of the Tsarist police. He spent years in prison and exile, but in 1861 he escaped from Siberia. Bakunin reached London, where he associated with the Nestor of Russian exiles, Alexander Herzen. Both wholeheartedly supported the Polish national uprising against Tsarist Russia when it broke out in January 1863. Bakunin attempted, unsuccessfully, to organize a Russian legion, and then took part in an unsuccessful expedition by sea to aid the partisans in Lithuania.

He returned to London. He did not intend to stay in Britain, but decided to settle in the more agreeable climate of Italy. A day before his departure, on 3 November 1864, Bakunin and Marx met once again. "I must say, I liked him very much and better than before," Marx informed Engels. He accepted Bakunin's views that the failure of the Polish uprising was due to the malicious influence of Bonaparte and to a refusal by the Polish aristocracy to proclaim "peasant Socialism," that is, a radical land reform. From then on, Bakunin intended to work only for the cause of Socialism.¹

According to another document written by Marx some five years later, Bakunin was recruited by Marx into the newly founded International. Subse-

quently, Marx sent him to Italy with the texts of the address and the statutes. Bakunin received them enthusiastically, but did nothing.² Still, in Spring 1865 Marx hoped to get Bakunin's aid in his struggle against Mazzinian influences. In fact, Bakunin went to Italy not only with Marx's but also with Mazzini's blessings. Bakunin used the names and addresses Mazzini gave him of partisans for recruitment into a secret organization of his own. Wandering from Genoa to Florence and then on to Naples, he planned to create still another organization with a more complicated structure and international ramifications. According to his plan, the compact and secret network, directed by a conspiratorial group of men and endowed with high revolutionary morale and iron will, would have at its disposal a looser organization acting in the open. It is difficult to assess how successful Bakunin was and what was reality and what fantasy. It seems that he did recruit members who after the ceremony of a handshake and a financial contribution were only bound by a loyalty to the founder. Arthur Lehning, a contemporary authority on the subject of Bakunin, maintains that his writings, programs, statutes, and various projects reflected rather the evolution of his ideas than the functioning of any organization.³ This may have been true until 1868.

Bakunin impressed many by his personal charm, spontaneity, and daring, but also by his ideas, which fell on fertile ground. His point of departure was opposition to the fundamentals of Mazzinian Republicanism, which included the principles of elated patriotism and belief in God. Bakunin rested his doctrine on antistatism and atheism. He believed that to liberate mankind, all authority—be it theological, political, or economic—must be rejected. A spontaneous revolution of the oppressed masses would destroy all the existing institutions. The freed society would then organize itself from below, through a system of voluntary communes and their federations. The task of conscious revolutionaries was to stimulate the destructive energy of the masses and, once a revolution broke out, to assure its full free rein. Although at that time, and later, Bakunin did not give any systematic exposition of his doctrine, it was the doctrine of revolutionary anarchism, as distinct from the moderate, peaceful anarchism (An-Archism) of Proudhon.

Eventually, Bakunin left Italy, where many of his friends had abandoned him. He settled in Geneva. There he took part in the congress of the League of Peace and Freedom in 1867. He attacked the Tsarist regime with animus and conviction, but refused to join those who saw in Russia the bulwark of European reaction. He thought that the essence of evil, that is, of "religious, bureaucratic and military centralisation," was the same everywhere, though in Western Europe it was hiding behind a constitutional mask. At the congress Bakunin met some members of the International who came to the congress straight from the International's congress in Lausanne. A speech by Dupont, who polemicized against Garibaldi's affirmation of religion, impressed Bakunin and led him to believe that these matters were of major importance to the workers' organization. Next year, Bakunin joined the central section of the International in

Geneva. He thought it proper to send a letter to the next IWMA congress, assembling in Brussels in September 1868. Bakunin recommended the collaboration of the two international movements, the League of Peace and Freedom and the IWMA.⁴

After the Brussels congress had rejected any collaboration, the chairman of the league, Gustaw Vogt, reproached Bakunin for initiating such a proposal. Bakunin's reply illustrates well his train of thought at that time. The workers' International, he maintained, was wrong in appropriating to itself the "social principles" that belonged to nobody. Naturally, they are readily accepted by workers whose condition moves them in that direction, while intellectuals reach them only "through the logical consequences of our thought." The league and the IWMA, sharing the ideals of freedom, justice, and of social and economic equality, must conclude an alliance based on division of labor: the IWMA would deal with economic questions and the league with political, religious, and philosophical questions. Such a division, Bakunin assured Vogt, was accepted by members of the International in Geneva. They were silenced, however, by the powerful influence and ill will of a "certain coterie." Yet the hope of the peace movement lay in its alliance with the workers' International. "Let us not forget, dear Friend," the letter concluded, "that the power belongs to them and not to us. Let us prove to them our right to exist, more for their benefit than for our."⁵

Soon after the conclusion of the congress in Brussels, the second peace and freedom congress met in Bern, between 21 and 25 September 1868. Backed by a number of delegates, Bakunin proposed a resolution postulating the "economic and social equalisation of classes and individuals" and the study of the means to achieve that aim. This seemed to many pure Socialism or even Communism. Answering his critics, Bakunin denied that he was a "Communist." "I detest Communism," he declared firmly. He said that communism aimed at centralization of property and the creation of an all-powerful state, and both were negations of freedom. "I want an organisation of society and a collective or social property from bottom to top, through free association, and not from top to bottom through an authority of any kind."⁶

Bakunin was opposed not only by bourgeois radicals and liberals but also by Proudhonists present at the congress. His motion was rejected. On the last day, Bakunin and seventeen of his partisans, who called themselves "démocrates socialistes," declared their secession. They were Swiss, Germans, Russians, Poles, Frenchmen, and Italians. They soon formed an organization named *L'Alliance internationale de la démocratie socialiste*, with a program and statutes of its own. The first point of the program read: religion must be replaced by science and God's justice by human justice. This seemed to summarize the philosophical basis of the alliance. In addition, the program included the equalization of classes and sexes, the abolition of hereditary rights, the rejection of all patriotism, and a society of the future based on free industrial and agricultural associations. One point emerged with great clarity: the alliance rejected all

political action that was not directed toward the immediate triumph of the working class over capital.

In its statutes, the alliance declared itself to be a branch of the International Working Men's Association. A central bureau of the alliance in Geneva and national and local bureaus had to direct the organization at the various levels. Monthly fees, 10 centimes per member, would be divided: half to go to the national organizations and half to be put at the disposal of the central bureau. The alliance would hold its yearly meetings to coincide with the congresses of the International.

Becker possessed another, probably earlier, text of the proposed statutes, whose author was Bakunin. It began with the following declaration: "La révolution, dans l'intérêt de son propre salut, doit faire une guerre de destruction tant au dedans qu'en dehors à la réaction sous toutes ses formes; à cet effet s'est constituée l'alliance internationale, laquelle devra organiser des sections dans les différents pays." Great powers were proposed for the central committee. Point 19 reads: "Le comité central remouvable par cinquième à chaque assemblée générale. Les candidats seront proposés par le comité et élu par l'assemblée."⁷

The proclamation founding the alliance was signed by eighty-four members of the "groupe initiateur de Genève." The provisional bureau included: Becker, Brosset, Duval, Geutat, Perron, and Zagórski. They were all members of the IWMA and one of them, Johann Philipp Becker, considered himself a staunch friend and pupil of Karl Marx. In addition, he headed the German-language-sections group, with a structure similar to the one adopted by the alliance, which may have served as a model. Through the alliance Becker hoped to extend the International into the countries of Southern and Eastern Europe. Becker and Bakunin were not the only ones who had the ambition to create and extend an autonomous international network. The French branch in London, whose status in the International became rather ambiguous, made such efforts. Also the extremely ambitious and troublesome Pierre Vésinier tried to establish contacts in a number of countries with the aim of creating his own network. When he proposed to Gignoux in Geneva to establish an "independent section" there, Gignoux replied: "Votre idée de former une section indépendante trouve pas de sympathie."⁸

In November 1868, Becker transmitted to the General Council in London the alliance's application for admittance. Becker sent the letter to Lessner instead of to Jung, who was the Swiss secretary, which offended Jung. The application, with the documents attached, reached Marx, and he reacted with fury. He filled the margins of the documents with biting comments. The point about the central bureau was met with the remark: "Nouveau conseil central!" Marx reacted to the idea of equality of the sexes by scribbling: "l'homme hermaphrodite! C'est comme la commune russe." His comment on the declaration of hostility to all patriotism and national rivalry was: "Il y a rivalité et rivalité, mon cher Russe."

At Becker's name, first on the list of "groupe initiateur," Marx wrote: "Asinus Asinorum."

Marx wrote the reply to the application from Geneva, and the General Council approved it on 22 December 1868. It was written in a sharp tone. The General Council believed that the presence of a second international body, operating within and outside the IWMA, would be the "most infallible means of its disorganisation." Should individuals in other places try to imitate the Geneva group, the International would become a field for the intrigues of "every race and nationality." Conforming to its statutes, the International could only admit local and national branches. In consideration of the above, the General Council refused to admit the alliance and declared "null and void" all the articles in its statutes that referred to the IWMA.¹⁰

In the meantime, the men in Geneva enthusiastically initiated another enterprise. At the beginning of 1869 the weekly *L'Égalité* started to appear. Its subtitle was *Journal de l'Association internationale des travailleurs de la Suisse romande*. The editors saw their new journal as not just for the French-speaking parts of Switzerland, but also for France and Belgium. Malon and Varlin in Paris and Marx, Eccarius, and Jung in London were invited to collaborate. Marx refused on the grounds that his health and his scientific work would not allow him to contribute. However, another Londoner, Cowell Stepney, expressed his "sincere interest."¹¹ Bakunin promised a series of articles on the subject of "the tremendous difference between the serious Socialism of the workers and the ridiculous Socialism of the bourgeois."¹² Bakunin's friends, including Becker, played a leading role in the editorial board, and their names were sent to the Geneva committee of the International.

Several weeks passed before the committee of the alliance gave its answer to the General Council. It was willing to dissolve the international organization and transform its sections into sections of the IWMA once its program was approved. This time, the reply of the General Council was couched in moderate terms. It is possible that Marx, who wrote the reply, was influenced by a personal letter that he had recently received from Bakunin. The letter, dated 22 December 1868, was full of reverence for Marx. Bakunin assured Marx that his great aim was the total destruction of the Tsarist empire. The General Council's reply to the alliance, accepted at its meeting of 9 March 1869, concentrated on theoretical questions. The reply said that the council was under no obligation to judge the program of the alliance except to consider whether its general tendency contradicted the general aim of the International, which was the complete emancipation of the working class. In this respect, one point in the alliance's program, that of the equalization of classes, raised objections. Marx wrote that it seemed to be a mere "slip of the pen," and the principle of the abolition of classes should be substituted. The General Council accepted the dissolution of the alliance as an international body, but asked to be informed of the place and numerical strength of each new section.¹³

In fact, Bakunin and his friends transformed their Geneva organization into a section of the International, retaining for it the name of Alliance de la démocratie socialiste but dropping the adjective *internationale*. The passage in their program on the "political, economic and social equalisation of classes and individuals of both sexes" was changed into: "the definitive total abolition of classes and the political, economic and social equalisation of individuals of both sexes." How Becker understood that principle is illustrated by one of his motions to the assembly of the alliance: "d'égaliser la jouissance des biens de la vie entre les plus forts et le plus faibles."¹⁴ The principle of abolishing the inheritance laws was left intact.¹⁵ On 27 July 1869 the General Council, on Marx's proposal, accepted the Geneva alliance as a section of the IWMA.¹⁶

Minutes of the alliance's general assemblies and meetings of its committee give us an insight into its ramifications and activities. A comparison of the list of eighty-four members of the initiating group in Geneva¹⁷ with lists of members and contributions compiled by Max Nettlau in his unpublished biography of Bakunin¹⁸ shows that of the eighty-four "founding members" over half were not members of the alliance at the time it transformed itself into a section of the IWMA. Some of the original eighty-four names were probably inserted without permission. Of some seventy-five members who paid dues between 1868 and 1870, over half paid dues for periods of five months or less—some paid dues only once. In January 1870 the section had 23.80 Swiss francs and in October 1870, 48.50 francs. A collection at the assembly of 21 May 1870 brought a sum of 1.65 francs. In July 1869, the committee of the alliance sent 10.40 francs to the General Council in London as a contribution on behalf of 104 members; that number of members was an obvious fabrication.

The alliance held assemblies each Saturday, and they were poorly attended. On 27 February 1869 twenty-six members were present; on 8 May, only twelve; and on 14 November, fourteen. The meeting of the committee on 15 January had only eight participants and five members were absent. Generally, attendance was erratic. The alliance's most disciplined member was Becker, until he broke with the group. At any one time the alliance had fifteen to twenty fully active members, but the composition of that group fluctuated. The alliance's members had personal antipathies and animosities, as in any group, although that contradicted the alliance's high ethical norms. Likewise, the irregular attendance at meetings and nonpayment of dues was contrary to the principles of tight discipline demanded by the statutes.

The ideological complexion of the alliance was by no means of a fixed nature. Bakunin's revolutionary principles were mitigated by his libertarianism and, at times, by his caution in applying them to practical politics. The committee, at its meeting of 22 January 1869, with six members present and seven absent, heard Bakunin criticizing speeches made by one of the secretaries at the assembly. These perorations, "through their revolutionary and provocative character compromised the very existence of the Alliance," said Bakunin. The committee unanimously adopted a motion, proposed by Bakunin, that the alliance, while

admitting the greatest freedom of debate and enquiry, "refuses to be a revolutionary club and rejects useless and provocative outcries and phrases." The alliance, "while discussing all the questions with the greatest liberty from the point of view of theory and study, eliminates from its programme all discussions on revolutionary practical application."¹⁹

Bakunin's articles, written at that period for *L'Égalité*, expressed moderation. His proposals to abolish the laws of inheritance stemmed from his search for practical, peaceful, and legal means to achieve the collective ownership of property, which was the great aim of the International as expressed at its most recent congress. Marx, who a little later criticized and ridiculed that idea, must have forgotten that it was included among the proposed measures of the victorious proletarian revolution in his and Engels's *Communist Manifesto*.

Yet as time went on the alliance found itself in growing conflict with the other older sections of the International in Geneva. These sections were dominated by the fabrique elements, and they viewed with disquiet the ambitions of a group claiming ideological and moral superiority, whose membership was mostly alien both in national and class terms. It is not surprising that when the alliance applied to join the union of the Geneva sections it met with refusal. It was also rejected later when it applied for admission to the newly formed *Fédération Romande*.

Not for one moment did Bakunin abandon his wider ambitions. He was in contact with friends abroad, some of whom were listed as members-correspondents of the Geneva section. One of the lists, established by Nettlau for June 1869, contains the names of Joseph Fanelli and Carlo Gambuzzi from Italy, Raphael Farga-Pellicer and Gaspard Sentifon from Barcelona, and a number of other Italians and Spaniards. The list also contained the names of some Swiss from outside Geneva, the most prominent among them being Adhemar Schwitzguébel.

Bakunin still considered Becker a friend and partisan. Becker's dissatisfaction with the refusal of the Eisenach congress to join his group and the strains in his relations with Marx led him into a closer association with Bakunin. He became Bakunin's confidant and learned his plans and innermost thoughts. In a most curious letter, dated 4 December 1869 (that is, four months after the alliance was admitted into the IWMA), Bakunin urged Becker to support the alliance, if for no other reason than as the "imaginary centre of propaganda and action" for Italy, Spain, Southern France, and also for parts of Switzerland. Becker was urged to support not so much a reality but a fiction. Bakunin made it even more explicit in the following passage: "You know better than I do that some imaginary existences are very useful and should not be despised. You know that in the whole of history there is for every quarter of reality three quarters, at least, of imagination," acting most powerfully on men.²⁰

At this time Bakunin became involved in one of the most mystifying ventures of his life. A young Russian by the name of Sergei Nechaev had recently arrived from Saint Petersburg and appeared among Bakunin's partisans. He claimed to

be the leading member of a powerful secret society in Russia. His concepts on how to struggle against the existing order and achieve a revolution largely coincided with Bakunin's. The two elaborated a document called the *Catechism of the Revolutionary*. They codified the moral norms and obligations of a true revolutionary. He was "a man without his own interest and problems, feelings, desires, property or even a name. All that is replaced by one exclusive interest, one thought, one desire—revolution. . . . He knows only one science, the science of destruction." They said that everything that helped the triumph of the revolution was ethical. The revolutionary organization must be built on the principle of strict discipline, hierarchy, and degrees of secrecy. It may seem that such a code of principles contradicted Bakunin's creed of libertarianism. Yet, it was part of Bakunin's thinking a long time before he met Nechaev. As early as 1864, Bakunin believed in forming a strongly disciplined organization, based on community of philosophical, political, and other ideas. In 1866 Bakunin composed a revolutionary catechism of his own, destined for a secret league of "the most intelligent revolutionaries," who would lead the masses. He visualized an "unseen dictatorship" with titles, rights and insignia.²¹ His penchant for such an elitist dictatorship had not disappeared, and the new catechism, whatever part Nechaev played in composing it, was the expression of the same line of thought. In a letter written to a "Lyon militant" in 1870 Bakunin postulated: "force collective, invisible, anarchie révolutionnaire dirigée" and "dictature collective et invisible." The French historian, F. Rude, describes Bakunin's system as a "curious synthesis of Proudhonism and Blanquism," almost "Marxist-Leninist."²²

In September 1869 Nechaev returned to Russia, armed with a mandate of a truly imaginary "Universal Revolutionary League." The mandate carried a number, 2771, and Bakunin's signature. It was also stamped with an inscription: "Alliance révolutionnaire européenne, Comité général." Nechaev could pretend to represent a powerful international organization and its headquarters, as he had pretended in the West to represent a similarly imaginary Russian organization. Armed with such a document, he achieved leadership within a secret circle in Moscow. When one of its members, a student by the name of Ivanov, became critical and suspicious of Nechaev, he was assassinated. Arrests followed, but Nechaev succeeded in escaping from Russia. From the beginning of 1870, he was back at the side of Bakunin, who had recently moved from Geneva to Locarno. Yet their friendship and collaboration ended within a few months. Bakunin began to denounce the hoaxes, adventurism, and criminal acts of his excomrade. Writing to a friend in London, Bakunin described Nechaev as a very dangerous fanatic who followed the teachings of Machiavelli and tried to imitate the practices of the Jesuit order. Bakunin complained: "He betrayed the confidence of all of us, he stole my letters, he compromised us horribly; in one word, he behaved miserably."²³

Despite Bakunin's change of heart and, perhaps, of views, his erstwhile association with Nechaev and his share of responsibility could not be erased and

were used against him by a growing phalanx of adversaries in Switzerland and abroad. The eventful story of Nechaev himself, who only incidentally and indirectly became involved in the history of the First International will not be given here. In August 1872 he was arrested in Zurich and handed to the Tsarist police. Tried and sentenced to twenty years hard labour, he died in 1882.²⁴

In the meantime, the next congress of the International was to convene in Basel. The question of land and other property, which increasingly dominated the deliberations of the last two congresses, was bound to become central at this one. The General Council was divided on the seemingly esoteric question of whether the conversion of arable land into the common property of society should be based on the principle of "social necessity" or of "natural right." The implication of the first principle, defended by Marx, was the collective organization of collective production. The O'Brienite Milner believed that nationalization of land must serve "the natural right of every individual to an interest in the soil of his own country." To Marx, small-scale farming was economically wasteful and politically dangerous, because of the illusions it created among the small producers. "The small man is only a nominal proprietor, but he is the more dangerous, because he still fancies that he is a proprietor." At the council's meeting of 13 July 1869 the issue came to a vote. Six members voted for the "natural right" formula and six for "social necessity." Lucraft, who was in the chair, cast his decisive vote in favor of the second formula.

The question of inheritance, which was proposed by the Geneva alliance, came next on the council's forum. Marx dealt with it at some length. After giving a historical-legal analysis of various systems of inheritance, he rejected the view that the abolition of the laws of inheritance would achieve a social transformation in the initial stages of the revolution. If the working class had sufficient power to abolish the right of inheritance, it would be powerful enough to proceed to expropriation, which would be a much simpler and efficient means to gain property. Marx proposed a resolution ("rather an essay than a resolution," complained Milner) that rejected the motion from Geneva. But this rejection was qualified: in a situation of social transformation, when the present economic basis had not yet been transformed but the working masses had gathered enough strength to enforce transitory measures, some alterations of the inheritance system could be effected. Marx's text was accepted by the General Council and recommended to the coming congress. It opened a door to a compromise with the faction in Geneva. Their proposals, if rephrased, could agree in part with the stand adopted in London.²⁵

The fourth congress of the International met in Basel and lasted from Sunday the fifth to Sunday the twelfth September 1869.²⁶ There were seventy-nine delegates present. The two largest delegations were the French and the Swiss, and they had an equal number of members, twenty-six—that is, each had one-third of the membership of the congress. The number of members in both delegations had increased tremendously in comparison with the Brussels congress. The French contingent was more working class in character than any other

group of delegates. The German delegation had twelve names on the official list, but some were from outside of Germany. From Paris, once again, came Moses Hess. The most prominent among the German delegates was Wilhelm Liebknecht, listed as the "delegate of the Congress of Eisenach." The Germans were mostly journalists, professors, and semiprofessional politicians. Austria was represented by two journalists: Neumayer and Oberwinder. Five delegates represented Belgium (instead of the fifty-six in Brussels): Hins, Brismée, Bastin, De Paep, and Robin, who was just in the course of moving from Brussels to Geneva. From Britain came six members of the General Council: Applegarth, Lucraft, Stepney, Jung, Eccarius, and Lessner. Spain was represented by Farga-Pellicer and Sentiñón, both friends of Bakunin. Bakunin was present for the first time at a congress of the International. He came not as the delegate of any Swiss section, but as the delegate of the ovalistes in Lyon and of a mechanics section in Naples. Another representative came from Naples, the tailor Stefano Caporusso. Among the Swiss, Bakunin had three close associates: Heng, Guillaume, and Schwitzguébel.

The official list was headed by a representative of "America," Andrew C. Cameron, the editor of the *Workingman's Advocate* in Chicago. He carried the mandate of the National Labour Union, the largest working-class organization in the United States. Although it had never affiliated to the International, its headquarters was in contact with the General Council in London. This contact was kept alive by the issue of the importation of strikebreakers from Europe to the United States.

As in the previous congresses, the dominant language was French, though this time one-third of the delegates were German speaking. Hermann Jung was once again elected to chair the congress. He was assisted by Bruhin and Brismée. The organization and the procedures of the congress were of a higher quality than at any of the three previous congresses. Also the delegates were more disciplined than at previous congresses. Five commissions were chosen to deal with the five points of the program, as set by the General Council. As many as nineteen members composed the commission dealing with trade unionism, eighteen made up the education commission, but only eight members composed the commission on the infinite subject of "mutual credit." Fourteen delegates were in the commission dealing with the question of property. The eleven-member commission on inheritance contained Bakunin and three of his friends, but not a single member of the General Council to defend the London resolution.

Karl Buerkli, the leader of the International in Zurich, proposed the inclusion in the program of an additional point: "direct legislation by the people for the people." The adoption of that proposal would have meant an acceptance of an important principle of radical democracy and participation in the existing "bourgeois" systems. Though it was anathema to the antistatists, one of them, Robin, agreed to such inclusion in the program, if time permitted. Schwitzguébel agreed without qualification. Yet Bakunin was intransigent. It is not clear what

was decided. It was probably agreed to discuss the issue at some extraordinary session, if time allowed; it was not discussed.

The first and most important question was that of land property. The commission dealing with that question declared itself for the principles of natural right and of social necessity. But the commission split as to the forms of organization in agriculture. A majority supported the idea of "solidarized communes," while the minority was in favor of leasing land to individuals or, preferably, to agricultural associations paying rent to the community. Among the majority were Becker, Lessner, and Varlin, while De Paepe, faithful to his previous stand, was among the minority, which included mostly French delegates. The discussion that followed revealed a great variety of views. Lucraft expressed his belief that land ownership should pass into the hands of the state and, therefore, agricultural production should come under the control of the government. This view presupposed that the working class would take over political power and that the present legislature would be changed into a "workers' parliament" that would become the "Central Council of the nation"; a minister of agriculture and other officials would be appointed to manage production. Lucraft's simple views disregarded the anxieties of many who feared such an extension and centralization of state power. The Parisian Langlois denounced "communisme autoritaire," which, in its extreme logic, had just been represented by the English delegate. Langlois was supported by Tolain and Chermalé defending the last bastions of individualism and the mutualist creed. Lessner, a veteran of the long-extinct Communist League, defended the much-abused "Communism." What he understood as its principles was that each child coming into the world should have the right to a good education and each person capable of work should have the right to instruments of labor, so as to lead a life worthy of a human being. Lessner seemed to be ignorant of the mutualist and anarchist critique of Communism.

Bakunin used the debate to air some of his more general views before a forum in which he had previously never participated. The congress, he said, had no agricultural representatives and so it represented only a minority. Yet in all past historical epochs only minorities represented the interests of all mankind. In 1789 the minority of the middle class represented the interests of the French nation and the whole world. This led to the rule of the bourgeoisie. It was Babeuf and his friends who in the name of the proletariat protested against the domination of capital. "We only follow in their steps; our minority, which will soon become the majority, represents all the working population of Europe." Bakunin was in favor of collectivizing the land and wealth in general by means of "social liquidation." This concept, which had already gained some currency within the International, Bakunin defined as the "abolition of the political and juridical state which is the sanction and the guarantee by which a small number of men appropriate the products of labour of the rest." He appealed for the destruction of "all national and territorial states" and the construction on their

ruins of an "international state of millions of workers," which was the task of the International.

It is not certain how accurately the congress report reproduced this or other speeches. The idea of an "international state" contradicted Bakunin's basic philosophy. Also his praise of Babeuf, who aimed at a Jacobin-like revolutionary dictatorship, would be a similar contradiction. However, the report gives some justification for the belief that the rising head of European anarchism was never pedantic enough in matters of theory and ideology.

The congress finally voted on the resolutions proposed by the commission in two parts: the first related to the "right" of society to abolish individual ownership of land, and the second to the "social necessity" of collective ownership. The distinction between the two was more than a subtlety or a gradation, yet nearly all who voted in favor of the first part voted also for the second, and they formed three-quarters of all the delegates. Delegates agreed to leave the question of the future system of agricultural production open, and sections were urged to reach their own conclusions and communicate them to the next congress.

The "collectivist-Communist" majority that emerged in Basel included most of the Swiss, the Germans, the Belgians, the Spaniards, and the Londoners. The French, with the exception of Varlin and the Lyon delegates, formed the bulk of the minority that either opposed the motions or abstained. It is interesting to note that in the important question of land ownership Eccarius, Jung, De Paepe, Varlin, Bakunin, and Guillaume were all on the same side.

The second matter of great importance, also relating to the question of property, was the abolition of the rights of inheritance. Bakunin, the main promoter of the principle, entered the arena for the second time. He argued that the abolition of the rights of inheritance was a practical measure at the earliest stage of social transformation that would precede social liquidation. He admitted that the dispossession of peasants and small landowners would throw them into the arms of counterrevolution. Therefore, they should be allowed for a limited period of time to keep their property. Without the abolition of inheritance, they would remain proprietors, able to pass land to their children. The abolition of that right, together with the abolition of all juridical and political rights of the state, would leave them in possession only of the land, and that, without the protection of the state power, would be "easily transformed and reversed by the force of revolutionary events." When the motion came to a vote, thirty-two of the sixty-eight delegates present voted for it, twenty-three voted against, and thirteen abstained. The motion lacked three votes to be passed. Lessner and Becker voted for the resolution. Other Londoners, the French *mutuellistes*, some Swiss delegates, and Hess and Liebknecht all voted against.

Next came the motion on the inheritance question as formulated in the Marxian text brought from London. Apart from Eccarius, nobody referred to it in the previous debate and it seems that only after that debate did it come to the notice of the delegates, other than the Londoners. Only sixty-two delegates were

present at this vote. Nineteen voted for the motion, thirty-seven against, and six refrained from voting. Becker was among the last group. Some delegates voted for both motions, the Bakuninian and the Marxian. The majority of the French delegates opposed both. Varlin voted for the first and opposed the second. De Paepe, an opponent of Bakunin's motion in the debate, refrained from voting on it, but voted against the motion proposed by the General Council. Despite a measure of defeat, Bakunin must have felt that he had triumphed over Marx. Yet, the great doctrinal conflict and public debates between the two men were still in the future.

The time remaining allowed for discussion of only one other point of the program—the question of trade unionism (“syndicats”) at the last plenary session of the congress. The question of direct legislation was forgotten. The motion on trade-union organization stressed the value of unions in the creation of organs of the new order, in particular the communes of the future. The common actions of the syndicates and of their federations would finally result in the replacement of the wage labor system by a federation of free producers. When it came to the vote, the proposals of the commission were carried unanimously. Collectivism and syndicalism were the victorious principles, accepted by the great majority in Basel.

Toward the end of the congress, the chairman invited the American Cameron to take the floor. His main concern was to stop the importation of workers from Europe into America, where the workers were employed as strikebreakers. He proposed the creation of bureaus as a joint venture of the National Labour Union and the IWMA. The delegates were invited to attend the next congress of the American organization, to be held in August 1870 in Cincinnati. It was obvious that he treated the International as an equal partner of his union. His speech, translated into French and German, met with applause.

The congress passed various administrative measures. Their general tendency was to formalize, if not strengthen, the rights of the General Council. Sections of the International could be suspended by the General Council, pending decision by the next congress. The General Council was authorized to decide disputes between organizations within one country or various countries, again with the right of appeal to the congress. The membership of the Council was approved. Paris was chosen as the seat of the next congress. Closing the congress, Jung proclaimed that the International had become a power to be reckoned with.

Although the Basel Congress confirmed only the victory of collectivism within the International, achieved already the previous year in Brussels, the attacks on the International and its recent congress increased everywhere. The International was branded as decisively “Communist.” The terminological confusion both within the International and outside of it was unending. Soon after the closure of the congress, De Paepe informed Marx that in Brussels “all workers are Communists,” though many of them dislike the term (undoubtedly, because they remembered the Babouvist and Icarian past) and so they had adopted the new name of collectivists. And he added: “Pour moi, cela m'est égal.”²⁷

Those of the French who remained faithful to their Proudhonist creed left Basel broken in spirit. Fribourg, who published his book on the International two years later, said that the International of the French founders finally died in Basel and what triumphed there was the omnipotent triumvirate: the German Communist Karl Marx, Bakunin, "the Russian barbarian as he liked to describe himself," and Blanqui, the frenzied apostle of authoritarianism. Admittedly, these were not Fribourg's immediate impressions of the Basel Congress, but a reflection colored by later events, the Paris Commune in particular.²⁸ Even Liebknecht, who voted for the crucial resolution on property, had second thoughts. He wrote to Bracke: "I am myself a Communist and, therefore, principally in agreement with the resolution." Yet he regretted its wording. "The French knew what they did when they protested at the Basel Congress against the vote."²⁹

One of the incidental results of the Basel congress was the enhancement of Bakunin's standing and fame. His temporary involvement with Russian affairs, through the medium of Nechaev, did not divert him from pursuing his aims in Switzerland and elsewhere in Europe. He found a new friend and ally, Paul Robin. Scion of a well-to-do family and well educated, Robin had moved from his native France to Brussels, where he became one of the leading members of the International. Expelled by the Belgian police after four years in Belgium, he settled in 1869 in Geneva, where he joined the editorial board of *L'Égalité*. His growing friendship with Bakunin enhanced the latter's position and weakened the ostracism of the *Fédération Romande*. Bakunin's main allies in the Jura were Guillaume and Heng, who had recently moved from Geneva to Chaux-de-Fonds. The two founded their own "propaganda section," whose declared aim was to unite "into one bundle the greatest possible number of societies in the country, leaving to each its liberty of action and its autonomy." Guillaume edited a journal, *Progrès*, and so toward the end of 1869 Bakunin had access to the columns of two organs of the International.

Bakunin's optimism was at its height. His new boldness was stimulated by his recent association with Nechaev and also by his growing ties with friends in the West. On 4 December 1869 in Lyon he met five men whom he considered his most trusted lieutenants: Guillaume, the Catalanian Sentiñon, Richard and Palix from Lyon, and Bastélica from Marseilles. A second meeting took place in the same city on the occasion of the conference, in March 1870, a meeting that resulted in the founding of the Rhône Federation. From the Jura came, on this occasion, Schwitzguébel, a trusted associate of Bakunin. He and his partisans tried to bring into their close and secret circle Varlin and other Parisians, but they had no success.

The paramount aim of this group was to discredit the council in London. Sentiñon in a letter to Varlin, of 1 February 1870, accused the General Council of failing to keep in touch with "the leaders of the revolutionary movement."³⁰ Convinced of their strength, Bakunin and his friends proceeded to challenge the authority in London openly. During November and December 1869 both

L'Égalité and *Progrès* published articles written by Robin and Guillaume that were critical of the General Council for not fulfilling certain obligations laid upon it by the statutes. The General Council failed to publish reports on the progress achieved in particular countries. It was also criticized for opposing the foundation of a British federation that would relieve the Council from cumbersome British internal affairs and allow it to concentrate on truly international issues. With particular venom, the writers attacked the council for its stand on the Irish question, which, according to the critics, was not a proper concern of the IWMA.

In the course of 1869, Bakunin's friend Alexander Herzen, writing from London, urged Bakunin to attack Marx openly and directly. Bakunin was doubtful and hesitant. Marx, replied Bakunin, still played a most benevolent role as a dam against bourgeois influences. Yet a time would come when Bakunin would have to fight Marx and his German and British associates, the champions of "state Socialism," in a struggle to the death. Bakunin said that the time had not arrived, yet he soon changed his mind.³¹

The strategy pursued by Bakunin and his supporters was aimed at diminishing, if not destroying, the prestige of the London Council, which by that time had assumed mythical proportions. It was also quite obvious that the main thrust was directed against the *spiritus movens* of the General Council, Karl Marx. It was Marx who undertook the task of replying to the accusations. His text was approved by the subcommittee of the General Council, which was informed about it on 4 January 1870.³²

The letter containing the refutations was sent not to the boards of the two journals but to the *Fédération Romande*. It denied to the two boards the right to demand any explanations from the General Council. Yet the particular points were answered at some length. Most painful of the accusations were the questions concerning the British scene. Marx wrote that the General Council took upon itself the task of directing British affairs because of the special role Britain played in the general strategy of the international proletarian movement. Britain was the most developed capitalist country, where society split into a handful of masters and a great majority of wage earners. Here the class struggle and the organization of the working class had reached a high degree of maturity and universality. From here, because of Britain's position in the world market, every revolution in the economy would immediately reverberate around the whole world. The General Council, having in its hands the lever of proletarian revolution, would commit a folly, nay a crime, should it let that lever fall into purely English hands. The English had at their disposal all the necessary material conditions for a proletarian revolution, but they lacked the spirit of generalization and the revolutionary passion. It was, therefore, the task of the General Council to supply these missing ingredients and so speed up the truly revolutionary movement in that country and, as a result, everywhere else. The work done by the General Council in this respect had been attested by serious organs of the British press and also in Parliament. The International was accused of poisoning the English spirit of the working class

and pushing it toward revolutionary Socialism. This extremely high appreciation for and optimism about the British potential for revolution contrasted with Marx's constant exhortations to the working-class movement there, which were often tinged with bitter irony and despair.

The Irish question was also set in a context that had wider ramifications. Having analyzed its strategic importance, Marx reached the following conclusion: the International's "first need is to encourage the social revolution in England. To this end a great blow must be struck in Ireland." Having dealt with some lesser points, the General Council declared its intention to communicate the text of the letter to all the committees that corresponded with it.³³

Even before the letter reached Geneva, relations between the Fédération Romande and the alliance had reached a low point. Bakunin's friends, including Becker, were forced to resign from *L'Égalité*, and the journal came under the control of the federation's committee.³⁴ Becker soon returned to the editorial board, on which a new and increasingly influential role was played by a young Russian, Nikolai Utin. *L'Égalité's* editors thought it prudent to assure readers that the journal still adhered to revolutionary positions.³⁵ Becker, taking to heart the criticism of his old friend in London Hermann Jung, adopted a firmer stand on German affairs on the side of the Eisenachers.³⁶ Soon, his friendship with Bakunin came to an end. Becker came to the assembly of the alliance on 26 March 1870 and, in Bakunin's absence, made important changes in the alliance's program. "L'Alliance se declare athée" was changed to "L'Alliance se declare materialiste." It is difficult to know whether Becker changed his own philosophical position from a Bakunin-like militant atheism into anything approaching Marxist materialism. He had still espoused the former position as recently as November 1869 in his journal, seeing in the "idea of God the source of all authoritative power," of "patriarchalism, monarchism, tyranny in the bourgeois house and in the peasants hut."³⁷ Of greater importance was another amendment proposed and carried through by Becker. The fifth article of the program postulated the abolition of "actually existing political and authoritarian states." The term "states" was changed into "governments." To this was added: "The dualism between state and society should disappear; society and state will become one." This was opposed by an antistatist formula: "society will remain, but states will disappear," proposed by the Russian Zhukovski; he was supported by only one member present. The thrust of Becker's motions was directed against Bakunin and his views.

Bakunin appeared at the next meeting of the assembly and argued with Becker. They decided to discuss the whole matter again at a later date but they never did. The program of the alliance remained in force in its original form. Bakunin and Becker became enemies, and Becker soon denounced his former friend as "more egoist than Communist, more demagogue than a democrat, more an intriguer than an agitator."³⁸

L'Égalité intensified its attacks on Bakunin and his comrades. They were accused of being "autocrats" and adherents of the "authoritarian principle."³⁹ On

another occasion, they were denounced as intellectuals for whom the ordinary people served as "marche pied," serving to achieve their devouring ambition.⁴⁰

A split within the International in Switzerland became inevitable. In March the propaganda section in Chaux-de-Fonds was refused admission to the federation. In April 1870, the second congress of the *Fédération Romande* assembled in Chaux-de-Fonds. One of the first points on the agenda was a motion to admit the alliance, previously rejected by the committee of the federation in Geneva. Twenty-one delegates, representing thirteen sections from Jura and Vevey, voted for the motion; eighteen delegates, representing twenty-two sections, voted against. The majority was led by Guillaume and Schwitzguébel, while the minority represented the fabrique elements, mainly from Geneva, and also partisans of the anticollectivist Coullery. The defeated opposition, claiming to represent the majority of sections and members of the federation, constituted itself as a separate congress. Two organizations emerged, both claiming the name *Fédération Romande*: one with headquarters in Geneva, the other in Chaux-de-Fonds. The first had at its disposal *L'Égalité*, the second, *Solidarité*, a journal that replaced *Progrès*.

The General Council in London, as could be expected, sided wholly with the Geneva center. Nevertheless, at its meeting of 28 June 1870 the council accepted the right of the other organization to independence, but suggested that it dropped the title *Fédération Romande* in favor of a "local title."⁴¹ This proposal was rejected by Guillaume and his friends. On 13 August the Geneva section, on Utin's suggestion, removed from its ranks Bakunin and three associates.

Opposition to Bakunin's authority sprang up among Russians in many places. A small group of Russians in Geneva, three men and three women, formed itself into the "Russian section" of the International and, with the help of Becker, applied for admission to the General Council. In their letter, dated 12 March 1870, they attacked Bakunin and paid homage to Marx, whom they also asked to become their representative in the General Council. The true head and inspiration of that group was Utin, Bakunin's implacable adversary. Utin participated in *L'Égalité* and had a small journal of his own, under the title *Narodnoye Delo* [*The People's Cause*]. He was keen to use Marx's growing authority among his compatriots in his fight against Bakunin and his party. He conveyed to Becker the urgency to print Marx's reply in his paper.⁴² The request from Geneva met with an instant and enthusiastic reception. In its meeting of 22 March the General Council admitted the new section and approved of its program and its statutes. Two days later, Marx wrote a letter to the Russians in which he accepted their mandate.⁴³

Sigismund Borkheim, a German "bourgeois" democrat living in London, occasionally supplied Marx with information on Russian affairs. He was known for his anti-Russian views, and he clashed with Bakunin at the first peace congress in Geneva, in September 1867. Borkheim was the first to put Nechaev into the limelight, by writing about him in Liebknecht's *Volksstaat* of 16 March 1870. Though Liebknecht clashed with Bakunin at the Basel congress and was

strongly aware of Bakunin's antipathy to the party founded in Eisenach, in a spirit of fair play he published in the columns of his paper his adversary's "Letters to the revolutionary movement in Russia" (16 and 20 April). On 14 May, Liebknecht published Nechaev's reply to Borkheim. This obviously angered Marx. Engels's reaction to Bakunin's "Letters" was more one of amusement than anger. Bakunin's reported 40,000 revolutionary students in Russia, "without a proletariat or peasantry behind them," had in Engels's view two choices: Siberia or emigration to the West. An invasion of that army of "educated, ambitious, hungry Russian Nihilists" would ruin the workers' movement of Western Europe.⁴⁴ Soon, Marx came in contact with Herman Lopatin, a highly educated Russian who had only recently arrived in the West. As a member of revolutionary circles, he was able to give Marx firsthand information on the true events in Russia. From Lopatin Marx learned all the details of Nechaev's doings, and, in particular, about the Ivanov murder case. Thus Marx came into possession of a most important trump card in his struggle against Bakunin.

War and Revolution

The outbreak of the war between France and the Prussian-led North German Federation, into which other German states were drawn, on 19 July 1870, opened a stormy chapter in the history of the IWMA. The interests involved and the true causes of the conflict were obscured by the claims of the warring sides. Although it was the imperial government of France that declared war, the conflict was due mainly to the provocations of Bismarck and to Prussia's desire to unite Germany under its domination.

The war immediately affected the working classes in both countries and became the major concern of the International. It was not the first time that the question of war had emerged. All the basic documents issued by the central authority in London came from the pen of Karl Marx, but very few inside or outside that body understood Marx's strategic considerations, in which he judged each war and national movement on whether it advanced or impeded the international workers' movement, and its great aim of Socialist revolution. Considerations of intrinsic justice of a particular national cause took second place, or no place at all. The great majority of the members of the International were deeply averse to militarism, which was seen as the mainstay of oppressive political systems and of economic exploitation. They believed, and hoped, that the overthrow of the existing system and its substitution by an international, or at least European, new order of things would eliminate wars and establish eternal peace on the firmest of foundations: a classless society. This view was explained nowhere better than during the Parisian trial of the International in Spring 1870. The main spokesman of the accused, the twenty-five-year-old turner, Chalain, denounced the use of the military for suppressing strikes. The progress of the

International, he said boldly, would lead to the triumph of the "social universal republic" and this would bring to an end all wars.¹

The accused at the trial were sentenced on 9 July, when the skies were already dark with menaces of war. Three days later, the Paris members of the International published an appeal to "workers of all nations," and, in particular, to their "brothers in Germany." They said that a war between France and Germany would be a fratricidal war. Its underlying motives were dynastic ambitions and conquests. The incitement of French and German workers against each other could lead only to the triumph of despotism on both sides of the Rhine.²

The aggressive policies of the imperial regime in France had been meeting with strong opposition. Yet the pronouncements of Germany and France, the military preparations, and then the outbreak of the war created in all classes of the population a patriotic euphoria that threatened to destroy all that the International stood for and had labored to achieve in the last few years. Soon after the war broke out, Varlin, now a refugee in Brussels, expressed his concern that the two nations, whose working classes were the hope of the International, would destroy each other horribly.³

The attitudes within the German labor movement were by no means unanimous. At meetings in Chemnitz, Leipzig, Nuremberg, and Munich, that is, in Saxony and Bavaria where anti-Prussian sentiments were strongest, the views and feelings expressed and reflected in the resolutions were similar to those of French workers. The Berlin section, responding to the Paris manifesto, assured the French Internationalists of complete reciprocity of sentiments. The Land Assembly of the Social Democratic party in Saxony, held on 17 July, with the participation of Bebel and Liebknecht, denounced in its resolution the character of the coming war, aiming to satisfy the ambitions of some rulers. The resolution was published in the columns of *Volksstaat* on 20 July, that is, a day after the outbreak of war. In the same issue, the committee in Braunschweig, acting as the national leadership of the Social Democratic party, appealed to workers to come to a mass protest meeting to be held there. This appeal, dated 16 July, differed in some important respects from the resolution from Chemnitz and similar resolutions. The Braunschweig appeal agreed with the antiwar manifesto of the French Internationalists, yet its main thrust was directed against the emperor of France, whose provocations, the appeal said, in particular the mobilization of the French army, amounted to a defiance of the German nation and to a declaration of war against it.⁴

When on 21 July the North German Reichstag voted on war credits, three Lassallean deputies voted for, while Liebknecht and Bebel abstained. The two declared that they had refrained from voting as that would have amounted to a vote of confidence for the Prussian government, while to vote against might have been regarded as approval for the outrageous and criminal policies of Bonaparte. In fact, their stand was of opposition rather than neutrality. They declared themselves to be, as social republicans and members of the IWMA, principled opponents of all dynastic wars. They expressed the hope that the

peoples of Europe would win their rights of self-determination and remove the existing militaristic and exploitative regimes.

Cowell Stepney, who met Liebknecht at this time on his travels in Germany, found him in a deeply pessimistic mood. In a letter to Marx from Munich, dated 1 September, Stepney communicated Liebknecht's resolve to leave Germany for England or the United States, if Prussia won the war. He also asked Stepney to inform Marx that if a revolutionary movement began in Paris, he would go there.⁵

The Belgian organizations of the International took a particularly important stand. In a declaration issued on 17 July the Belgian leaders protested against the threatening war. Once the war began, they said, it would endanger the solution of the labor question to which all other questions were subsidiary and which, under conditions of peace, could be solved within a few years. A week later, when the war had already broken out, the Belgian International urged the peoples involved in the war by their rulers to turn the war of despots into a "war of peoples against despots."⁶

On the day war broke out, the General Council authorized Marx to compose the text of an address that would define the attitude of the International. Marx's own thinking about the war accorded with the principles he applied to previous military conflicts. In a letter written on 20 July, one day after the war's outbreak, he expressed the hope that the French would be beaten. A Prussian victory would lead to the centralization of state power in Germany and this would advance the process of centralization of the German working class. Also, the center of gravity of the European labor movement would shift from France to Germany, that is, to the advantage of the German workers, who in the fields of theory and organization were more mature than the working class in other countries. The dominance on the world scene of German workers over French would, in turn, assure the preponderance of "our theory over that of Proudhon."⁷ Such an attitude, expressed by Marx in exile in London, contrasted with that taken by Bebel and Liebknecht.

The address was written by Marx in record time. It was presented to the council's subcommittee on 23 July and approved by the plenum of the Council three days later. The address denounced the French emperor as the main author of the war plot. The war, whatever its outcome, would spell the end of the second empire. Marx assessed the other warring nation: "On the German side the war is a war of defence." Yet, Prussia was blamed for being the power that enabled Bonaparte to launch a war against Germany. Bismarck's policies had brought about a situation in which Germany was compelled to defend herself. The address said that the German working class must be on guard in case the war lost its defensive character and degenerated into a war against the French people. Toward the end, Marx invoked, as he did in the past, the old specter of the sinister power in the East. "In the background of this suicidal strife looms the dark figure of Russia." The German people were warned not to appeal for the help of the Cossacks. The address concluded with ringing internationalist

phrases. The English workers stretched their brotherly hand to German and French workers. The alliance of workers of all countries would eradicate war once and for all.

The tone of the debate at the meeting of the General Council on 19 July was one of equal condemnation of both sides. Marx's text was, by no means, faithful to this attitude, and yet the members who attended the next meeting, on 26 July, hardly sensed the subtle differences in how the address assessed responsibilities and defined the character of war. "The address was received with general approbation," we read in the report. The members were concerned with the quick distribution of the address.⁸ Within a few days 2,000 copies were printed. The peace society, until now regarded by the IWMA as an adversary, contributed the princely sum of £20, which was sent to Becker in Geneva to cover the cost of the German and French translations.⁹

On 2 September the French army was defeated at Sedan and the emperor himself was taken prisoner. Two days later, a revolution in Paris brought the Second Empire to an end. A republic was proclaimed with a government of national defense at its head. The German army entered Alsace and Lorraine and the annexation of these provinces became the aim of the invaders.

Three days after the battle at Sedan, the German Social Democratic party issued a manifesto. Its predominant tone was the changed character of the war. The manifesto said that it was in the interest of the German nation to conclude peace with the new French republic. It must be a just peace. An "insulting peace" would be only a temporary armistice, lasting until France felt strong enough to erase the insult. Regarding Alsace-Lorraine, the manifesto quoted a lengthy passage from a letter written by "one of our oldest and most deserving comrades in London." The unnamed author, whose identity could not be mistaken, denounced the plans of annexation. The manifesto quoted an interesting observation from the letter from London: the center of gravity of the European labor movement had moved from France to Germany. In the spirit of that letter, the manifesto of the German Social Democrats protested against the intended annexation. On 9 September members of the party's committees in Braunschweig were arrested as the authors of the seditious manifesto.

Marx was angry at the inclusion in the manifesto of his remarks regarding the "center of gravity." He thought it was a shameful indiscretion by "these donkeys" from Braunschweig.¹⁰ So far, he had been communicating his optimistic prognoses only confidentially in his letters to Engels. As we know, Liebknecht's feelings as to the prospects of German labor after a German victory were quite different from those of Marx. There must have been many more pessimists. Carl Boruttau, the previously mentioned medical doctor and the editor of the *Volksfreund*, who was a most keen Social Democrat, wrote from occupied France where he served in the army to Becker in Geneva that there were greatest prospects in France for the victory of Socialism "without bloody terrorism." He intended to settle in France for good once the war ended.¹¹

On 6 September, four days after the battle at Sedan and two days after the revolution in Paris, the General Council assembled to discuss the situation.¹² The English members approached the outcome of the war from a rather narrow, "common-sense" point of view. Harris thought that the French should be grateful to the Germans for freeing them from the tyrant and said that the International should appeal to the victors to be magnanimous. Boon believed that the population of Alsace-Lorraine would prefer to come under German rule. Marx contradicted him angrily. Germany would now be the oppressive military power, while France, rejuvenated through a revolution, would become a force for progress. Eventually Boon proposed the appointment of a committee, to be composed of Marx, Jung, Milner, and Serrailier, charged with composing a new address.

Three days later, the text, written solely by Marx, was read at a special meeting of the council and approved unanimously. The full blast of this second address was directed against the annexationist fury that seized the German Liberal middle class, "with its professors, its capitalists, its aldermen, its penmen." The historical pretensions as well as the arguments of *raison d'état* were treated with sarcasm. Of course, the Russian menace was invoked and the blindness of German "patriots" to Russian militarism was denounced. Germany, in possession of French provinces, must either become the slave of Russia or face the alliance of Slav and Roman races against herself.

Although the revolution in France was welcome, the address expressed concern because the revolution lacked social content. The provisional government in Paris was composed of notorious Orleanists and bourgeois Republicans, some of whom carried the stigma of June 1848 when a workers' insurrection was drowned in blood. This new republic inherited from the empire its fear of the working class. Yet, the French workers were warned not to attempt the overthrow of the provisional government at a time when the enemy stood at the gates of Paris. They were urged to use the full means provided by republican freedom and to concentrate on the organization of their forces.

The warnings given in this last passage were occasioned by the departure from London of many French émigrés, including members of the detested French branch. On 6 September Marx informed his friend in Manchester that Serrailier, one of the "Marx party" in the General Council, had left for Paris to watch over developments there and establish contact with the federal council of the International. The French branch, according to Marx, wanted to commit various stupidities: overthrow the provisional government, resurrect the Commune, send Pyat as ambassador to London, and so on.¹³

One thousand copies of this second address were printed, and at the end of September the two addresses on the Franco-German war were printed together.¹⁴ *Volksstaat* in Leipzig and *Vorbote* in Geneva printed the German translation, done by Marx. The French translation appeared in *L'Internationale* in Brussels, and an incomplete version was printed in *L'Égalité* in Geneva. The address was not printed in France, which was engulfed in a full-scale war.

The German army was now on the outskirts of Paris. A National Guard sprang up quickly to defend the besieged city. It was mainly working class and its number soon rose to 350,000. A central committee of the National Guard was formed. Vigilance committees were constituted in the various arrondissements. Despite some misgivings, the International participated in this mass movement of the Paris population. Varlin, who came back from exile to France, was the member of the International most instrumental in achieving that collaboration.¹⁵ Members of the guard and the vigilance committees were increasingly distrustful of the government and of General Trochu, who commanded the defense of the capital. The new authority was suspected of monarchist tendencies and of the desire to capitulate to the enemy. Loud voices called for another revolution and for the proclamation of the "commune," which, like its predecessor of 1792-1793, would wage ruthless war on the external and internal enemies.

The members of the Paris International gave vent to their burning patriotism in a proclamation calling the French people to *la guerre à l'outrance*. They wanted a new France to be built on the basis of autonomous communes, united in a federation. They appealed for land to be given to the peasants, mines to the miners, and factories to the workers.¹⁶ They also issued an appeal "To the German people" and to the "Social Democracy of the German nation," written in both German and French and distributed as a leaflet. It warned that the French people would not accept peace with the enemy occupying their territory. The Germans were urged to return to the other bank of the Rhine and then participate with the French in the building of a United States of Europe, to be extended later into a "universal republic."¹⁷ Marx considered this manifesto to be an "absurdity" and contrary to the spirit of the International.¹⁸

On 27 October, Marshall Bazain surrendered the Metz Fortress, with an army of 150,000 men, to the Germans. Four days later, angry Parisians, led by revolutionary hotheads, attempted a coup. Another attempt was made on 22 January 1871. The two attempts and their suppression speeded the decision of the government to conclude an armistice. The Germans occupied some forty departments of France and surrounded Paris. The terms of the armistice provided for the handing over to the Germans of the forts around Paris and the disarming of regular troops. The National Guard was still allowed its arms to keep order in the capital. Soon the government decreed an election to the National Assembly that would deal with the new order of France and, more immediately, with the question of peace. The monarchist candidates were in favor of a swift settlement with the Germans. That won them the hearts and the votes of the majority of the peasantry, the largest class in France. Monarchists, of all the three varieties, won two-thirds of the seats. The minority consisted of moderate and radical Republicans. In Paris, the International formed a Revolutionary Socialist party, which put forward forty-three candidates. Although they won substantial numbers of votes in the particular districts, only two candidates were elected: Tolain and Malon. Even two members of the International in the National Assembly were

too many for some people. The Parisian *La Petite Presse* wrote that the two received 2,000 francs from the International as instalments of a promised subsidy of 200,000 to cover their costs. The council of the Paris International decided not to protest, convinced by Frank's argument: "Je suis satisfait de voir la bourgeoisie et ses journaux s'occuper de nous et de nous craindre."¹⁹

The National Assembly met in Bordeaux and elected the old Orleanist historian Auguste Thiers as head of state. Then it moved to Versailles. Ministries remained in Paris, where the only armed force was the National Guard. The guard's central committee gained prestige and confidence. By mid-March nearly half of this committee consisted of members of the International and trade societies.²⁰ To disarm the National Guard became Thiers's primary task. At this request, Bismarck released some arms for French troops and allowed the troops free passage through German lines. Thiers took measures to limit and then to eliminate the power of the citizenry guarding and defending the capital; measures that from the very beginning could not fail to wound the guard's pride and provoke resistance. The Bonapartist General d'Aurelle de Paladines was appointed commander of the National Guard. Auguste Blanqui, who had returned from Belgium after the 4 September revolution, was soon arrested and charged with responsibility for the insurrection of 31 October. He was sentenced to death. The government repealed some wartime measures that had until now alleviated the harsh conditions in the poorer sections of the city, in particular, the moratorium on payments of rents and debts. Now rents and debts had to be repaid within two weeks. These measures hit not only workers but also small artisans and shopkeepers. Whether it was the government's intention to provoke another insurrection, which would be easily defeated, or whether the government simply blundered, a revolutionary outbreak in Paris became a certainty.

Early in the morning of 18 March troops sent by Thiers arrived in Paris to confiscate the guns belonging to the National Guard. Since these guns were bought from funds provided by the population and were the unquestionable property of the guard, the government's action was treated as an outrage and a provocation. Members of the guard instantly resisted. The soldiers sent to Paris had no heart for the task. The authorities reacted by swiftly evacuating the troops and the civil administration from the capital to Versailles. The wealthy families still in Paris also left.

The vacuum of power was filled immediately by the central committee of the National Guard. It proclaimed the seizure of power by the "proletarians of Paris" in the face of the defeat and the treachery of the ruling class. An amnesty for political offenders was declared and wartime economic measures were reintroduced. However, not all members of the International were enthusiastic. Concern and skepticism were expressed at the meeting of the federal council on 22 March. Malon feared a bloodbath. At the well-attended meeting the next day, Spoetler, a syndicalist leader, opposed a full participation in "that movement." Aubry, who had come from Rouen to Paris, expressed his disenchantment with such an attitude. "The Revolution of 18 March is fully social," he said. He

proposed inviting the guard's central committee to join the International. Aubry must have convinced his Parisian comrades to abandon all hesitation and affirm their full support for and participation in the coming election.²¹

The guard's central committee was determined to transfer power into the hands of democratically elected representatives of the people. An election took place in record time, on 26 March. The electoral roll of 1870 remained in force, and of the half million people entitled to vote, out of 2 million inhabitants in the capital, about a quarter of a million took part in the election. This was quite an achievement; less than that number had voted in the elections of mayors in the arrondissements of Paris on 5 November 1870. Voting was much heavier in poor and working-class areas than in wealthy areas, and many people in the wealthier areas boycotted the election. Eighty-five candidates won ninety-three mandates. Several candidates were elected twice and one candidate, Varlin, three times. Blanqui was elected twice, but his membership in the elected assembly was purely symbolic. At its first sitting the new authority adopted the proud name *Commune de Paris*. The name had a tradition back to the communal authority in the Middle Ages but resurrected more vividly the tradition of the Commune of 1792.

Not all who were elected participated in the Commune's meetings and activities. Some formally resigned their mandates. At the Commune's first meeting some fifty elected members were present. A supplementary election took place on 16 April when thirty seats had to be filled. Eventually, only twenty-one candidates were elected because of the more stringent requirement of receiving a minimum of fifty-one percent of the votes cast. As a result of the supplementary election, the Commune consisted of seventy-one members. Two-fifths of the commune members were workers or artisans, a number that was in complete contrast to any other representative institution of that time. (Not a single worker or artisan entered the House of Commons elected in 1868 on the basis of a reformed and much widened franchise.) About one-third were members of free professions, mostly journalists and writers. Others were clerks, shopkeepers, and so on. The well born and the rich, so strongly represented in the National Assembly, were absent.

The Commune was divided into a majority and minority. The majority was a coalition of neo-Jacobins and of Blanquists. They were divided by a doctrinal principle: the Blanquists were Socialists, the neo-Jacobins accepted only some moderate social reforms. Yet the two groups agreed on one important practical point: the necessity to institute a centralized Jacobin-like power, acting dictatorially and aiming to extend that power into the whole of France. The minority, too, was a coalition, containing the old-style Proudhonists and the partisans of syndicalism and collectivism. Their theoretical disagreements, so openly manifested at the congresses of the International and elsewhere, now played hardly any role. What kept them together was not only their camaraderie of long standing but also their libertarianism, their antipathy to any dictatorial power, and their rejection of the use of extralegal measures and methods.

The Internationalists in the commune formed its active core and were counted among the most hardworking and self-sacrificing members. Some of them performed high and important functions. It is not easy to establish the exact number of members of the International who sat in the Commune. In the election of 26 March some of them achieved record numbers of votes, which was a test of their popularity. Among them were: Varlin, Theisz, Malon, Murat, Chalain, Beslay, and Camélinat. Malon, having overcome his original skepticism, figured among the candidates and once elected resigned his seat in the National Assembly. Tolain, however, refused any involvement in the Commune and remained a member of the National Assembly. Surprisingly, Frankel, the representative of the German section of the Paris International, achieved a remarkable number of votes in the district of Gobelins: 4,080 out of 8,010. On 16 April, three more prominent Internationalists were elected: Longuet, Johannard, and Serraillier. All three were, at different periods, members of the General Council in London. Two seats were held by members of the London French branch who had returned to Paris, Pyat and Vésinier. A curious personality, Cluseret, an exmember of the International in the United States, was also elected. He was a man with a discredited past and a brutish temper; he brought ignominy and trouble to the cause of the Commune.

From the beginning, the members of the International interpreted the events of 18 March and the nature and aims of the Commune in different ways. Varlin, the leader of the syndicalists-collectivists and the moving spirit of the whole minority, originally looked upon the Commune as the revindication of the medieval self-government of Paris. Guillaume related how he and his friends in Switzerland looked at the events in France as the signal of an "international revolution." Varlin, when he met one of that circle on 25 March, disagreed. "The movement of 18 March had no other aim than to revindicate the old municipal franchises of Paris and that aim was achieved," he said.²²

The federal council of the International in Paris defined their aims in a proclamation issued on 23 March in conjunction with the federal chamber of workers' societies. The proclamation saw in the Paris Commune a stepping stone to a federation of communes in the whole of France, "a Republic of the highest form."²³

Members of the Commune tended toward class collaboration and the conciliation of interests, conspicuous not only among the neo-Jacobins but also among the Proudhonists. Some representatives of the minority, in a declaration presented to the Commune on 29 March, proposed to convene a convention that would have the participation of workers' societies, the chamber of commerce, syndical chambers, Banque de France, and transport enterprises, so as to ensure work and trade indispensable to social peace and freedom.²⁴ Yet, on 18 April a declaration of aims was accepted by the Commune with one vote against. This happened only after the term *communisme césarien*, denouncing the imperial regime, was deleted. The declaration proclaimed the aim of instituting autonomous communes in the whole of France. They would form a federation with

central authority vested in a delegation of federated communes. All the citizens would possess full political and civil rights, including the right of intervention in communal affairs through the free manifestation of their ideas and the free defense of their interests. The declaration said that the Commune of Paris ought to immediately undertake administrative and economic reforms. It ought to create institutions for the purposes of education, production, exchange, and credit. It would generalize power and property. Paris had no wish to extend any dictatorship over the rest of France. It aimed at a free and spontaneous cooperation of all individual energies in order to achieve liberty and security for all. The mission of Paris was to accomplish this greatest and most fruitful of all revolutions.²⁵

The declaration was issued amidst an already raging civil war. The Commune had to create from scratch the various organs and institutions after the old administration collapsed or moved to Versailles. Already at its first meeting the Commune had elected ten commissions to administer all the affairs of the capital. Nine of these commissions were in charge of the military; food and supplies; finance; justice; security; public services; external affairs; education; labor, industry, and exchange. The tenth was the executive commission, charged with the task of coordination and general supervision. Members of the commissions were elected from among the members of the Commune, and so the legislative and the executive powers merged into one. That allowed for the possibility of direct control by the population of all the executive organs, whose members, like all members of the Commune, were liable to recall by the electors.

In the short period of the existence, the Commune rarely intervened in the economy, despite its declared intentions. The various, rather moderate, acts affecting that sphere were born out of the necessities of war. The acts forbade the eviction of tenants, imposed maximum prices on food, abolished night work in bakeries, and forbade fining workers in shops and factories. Enterprises working for the Commune came under supervision, which included the imposition of minimum wages. More essential was an act promulgated on 16 April that decreed the takeover by worker cooperatives of enterprises abandoned by their proprietors, to whom compensation was to be paid. It was too late to implement that act. It would be hard to estimate to what extent the act was a pointer to any future developments, had the Commune survived. Another project, to create Commune-owned buildings and repair enterprises, also was never enforced. One industry, however, armaments, became public property, and the workers were allowed to choose their directors and foremen and to participate in management. The pay structure was reformed: very high rates were lowered and low rates increased. Similarly, salaries of officers of the Commune were not allowed to rise above the level of average wages paid to qualified workers.

The Commune insisted on free, obligatory, and secular schools. Professional training was given priority. Libraries, theatres, and museums were opened to the working population.

Despite these and other achievements and reforms, the Commune lacked sufficient force and determination to deal with all the problems imposed by the ruthless march of the war. The onus of responsibility for the war was laid, with justice, on Versailles, yet the Commune avoided any acts that might have been interpreted as aggressive. The battalions of the National Guard lacked sufficient discipline, and only with great difficulty could the war commission and the high command impose order. Once Thiers mobilized and commanded a sufficient force, he attacked Paris without compunction. No help came from other parts of France. Communes were proclaimed in Marseilles, Lyon, Narbonne, Toulouse, and Creusot, but they were quickly suppressed. Appeals by the Commune to the peasantry, by means of leaflets dropped by balloons behind the enemy lines, were to no avail. French peasants often had family links with city workers but hardly any sympathy for their demands and aspirations. Politically, they were under the sway of the clergy or Republican politicians. Young peasants in army uniforms were easily persuaded that the "Communards" were enemies of France.

On 1 May the Commune decided to form a committee of public salvation. It was endowed with dictatorial power to ensure the proper defense. This matter, more than any other, divided the Commune. Most members of the International in the Commune opposed the measure. Of the sixty-eight present members, forty-five voted for forming the committee and twenty-three against.²⁶ On 15 May, the minority declared that the Commune had abdicated in favor of a dictatorship. They decided to withdraw from the meetings of the Commune and limit themselves to work in their particular districts. The federal council of the International demanded of its members in the Commune that they justify their action. Eventually, it approved their conduct, but it also recommended that all should work for the reestablishment of unity within the Commune.²⁷

On 21 May, some army detachments pierced the defences in the south and entered Paris. After a week of the most bloody fighting, the last working-class quarters, Belleville and Menilmontant, fell into the hands of government troops. Days of savage revenge and retribution followed. Thousands of soldiers of the Commune and also civilians were shot. The massacres were given a partly legal sanction by mock trials by military courts. Varlin was recognized in the street by an enraged crowd of anti-Communards, severely beaten and wounded, and then tried by a military court that sentenced him to death. Thousands died in prisons and camps or were deported to colonies overseas. The massacre in Paris ended with the growing threat of epidemics. Employers, concerned about the loss of the labor force on such a scale, intervened with the authorities. The Paris Commune ended in a sea of blood. It became an important landmark in history and also the catalyst of change and conflict within the Workers' International.

The Commune and the war that preceded it led to various repercussions in the Continental organizations of the International. When the Franco-German war broke out, Bakunin's anti-Germanism spurred him to a feverish activity on

behalf of France. He issued a series of six letters, dated 1–15 September, entitled *Lettres à un Français sur la crise actuelle*. He called on the popular masses of France to start an uprising that would be "immense, spontané, tout populaire, en dehors de toute organisation officielle, de toute centralisation gouvernementale."²⁸

On the morrow of the overthrow of the empire, James Guillaume published a manifesto in *La Solidarité* addressed to the sections of the International, inviting their members to rise in arms and not to spare blood for the cause of liberty, the cause of the working class, and all humanity. The Swiss authorities confiscated the paper. The manifesto met with the protests of Coullery's *La Montagne* in its issue of 7 September and, more importantly, of *L'Égalité* of 12 September. Guillaume responded by appealing in a letter to Becker to bury the hatchet and join hands in the forthcoming great tasks.²⁹

Having received some funds, Bakunin left for France. On 20 September he arrived in Lyon in the company of two friends: the Russian Ozerov and the Pole Lankiewicz. With his Lyon partisans he soon formed a committee for the salvation of France. On 28 September Bakunin and his partisans took direction of a workers' demonstration protesting against the lowering of wages. The crowd took possession of the city hall for several hours, until a detachment of the National Guard came and ejected them. Bakunin was arrested, but he was soon freed by his comrades. When one of Bakunin's associates in Lyon, Richard, came later to England and openly advocated the cause of the deposed French emperor, it was easy for Bakunin to blame him for the collapse of the committee in Lyon.³⁰

Bakunin went to Marseilles and from there through Genoa he reached Locarno, where he settled. His state of feverish euphoria changed to one of utter pessimism. Now he believed that Europe faced a period of black reaction that would last many years.³¹ He sat down to compose a major work. It was published in April 1871 under the title *L'Empire knouto-germanique et la révolution sociale*.³² He thoroughly condemned the political systems of both Russia and Germany. He also attacked, for the first time openly and in print, Karl Marx and his supporters, in particular the German Social Democrats.

Bakunin's hopes revived when news reached him of the events of 18 March in Paris, although he was still skeptical. In a letter to Ozerov of 5 April he wrote: "In all probability, the Parisians will perish, but they will not perish in vain, having accomplished their task. . . . They will bring under, with themselves, half of Paris. . . . Only the most desperate measures and determination to destroy everything with themselves could save the cause."³³ Four days later, he wrote in the same vein to Ogariov, the famous Russian émigré. The few men and the scarce resources at their disposal, "our only treasure," should not be sacrificed to a forlorn cause; they had to be saved for the day "when the devil wakes up."³⁴ Yet, despite all the black thoughts, he and Guillaume, during an encounter in Locle, made a plan of general insurrection in France, to be supported by the workers of the Jura.

On 30 April, while the Versailles troops bombarded the capital and tried to force an entry, another insurrection in Lyon was attempted. From Geneva came Zhukovski, Perron, and Ozerov to support it and give it direction. This attempt, too, failed completely.

The defeat of the Commune soon created new problems. The mass of refugees who flooded into Switzerland, Belgium, and Great Britain added to the strength of the International in those countries but also to the International's concerns. The fall of the Commune hardened the reactionary tendencies of Continental governments, and their impact was soon felt throughout the working-class movement.

London 1871

The London Council dealt with the most dramatic events of 18 March in Paris at its meeting three days later. Engels, who had moved from Manchester to London in September 1870, gave a thorough assessment of these events.¹ A week later, Marx informed the council that Serrailier, helped by a subsidy of £5, had returned to Paris. During his previous visit in Paris, Serrailier had acted as the true plenipotentiary of the council, issuing instructions and also criticisms of the Parisian federal council. At one of its meetings, he criticized the Paris organization as comparing unfavorably with London. In London the International was a political power of the first order. He added: "qu'un mouvement socialiste éclate, l'Internationale est prête en Angleterre. En France, il n'en est pas de même."² This was a curiously distorted perception.

The most important contact between London and Paris was the one established between Marx and Frankel. In a letter, dated 30 March, the latter informed Marx of his election to the Commune's commission for labor and industry. Frankel considered his election important as a manifestation of a true internationalist spirit. He asked Marx's advice on "social reforms" to be undertaken by his commission.³ This letter was answered after an unduly long time. Marx's reply hardly concerned the requests made by Frankel. Marx dealt mainly with the conflict that had developed within the Commune between Serrailier and Pyat. Marx alluded to grave stains on Pyat's character and on his private life. Finally, he gave some advice, but it concerned mainly the question of how to place the Commune bonds on the London stock exchange.⁴ Once again,

Frankel wrote to Marx, asking advice on reforms in the areas for which he was responsible. This letter was ignored. Yet on 13 May Marx wrote a letter addressed jointly to Frankel and Varlin and sent, as was his previous letter, through an intermediary. He assured the two leaders that he had sent "hundreds of letters to all corners of the world where we have sections," which was somewhat deceitful information. He also advised that any papers compromising the "canailles" of Versailles should be dispatched to a "secure place" (one could presume, to London).⁵ A few days later, the Versailles troops entered Paris and began the massacre of the working-class population.

During the days of the Commune, Marx was charged by the General Council to compose another address on the events in Paris, but he delayed it, waiting for the final end of the struggle. On 30 May, two days after the last ramparts of the Commune had fallen, Marx came to the meeting of the council and read the draft of his address. The text was approved unanimously. It soon appeared as a brochure under the title: *The Civil War in France: Address of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association*.⁶

This address is one of the most important documents in the history of the International and, even more, in the history of the Marxist doctrine. After a historical outline leading to the events of 18 March and a moving description of that day, Marx gave an analysis of the newly emerging system, embodied in the Commune. It was the definitive form of a "social republic," which Paris workers had already tried to achieve in the insurrection of June 1848. It replaced the standing army by a force of armed people, made police serve the people, and broke the power of the clergy, the tool of spiritual oppression. Education was opened to all, and scholarship became free from class prejudice and government control. The judiciary were elected instead of appointed and, therefore, were accountable to the people. The Commune embodied both legislative and executive powers and so subjected the high offices of the executive, chosen from among the legislative body, to the direct control by the people; the remoteness of the government in all previous regimes was thus eliminated. The Commune became a model for the whole of France and formed a basis for future self-government by the producers. Deputies elected to any organ—local, provincial, or national—would be responsible to the electorate, acting on its instructions and liable to be removed by a majority of electors.

The unity of the nation was not to be broken, but, on the contrary, to be organised by the Communal Constitution, and to become a reality by the destruction of the state power which claimed to be the embodiment of that unity, independent of, and superior to, the nation itself, from which it was but a parasitic excrescence. . . . Instead of deciding once in three or six years which member of the ruling class was to misrepresent the people in Parliament, universal suffrage was to serve the people, constituted in communes, as individual suffrage serves every other employer in the search for workmen and managers in his business.

The true secret of the Commune was that it was essentially a working-class government, "the political form at last discovered under which to work out the economical emancipation of labour."

Marx dealt with the accusations of the bourgeoisie with irony (reminiscent of some passages in the *Communist Manifesto*).

The Commune, they exclaim, intends to abolish property, the basis of all civilisation! Yes, Gentlemen, the Commune intended to abolish that class property which makes the labour of many the wealth of the few. It aimed at the expropriation of the expropriators. It wanted to make individual property a truth by transforming the means of production, land and capital, now chiefly the means of enslaving and exploiting labour, into mere instruments of free and associated labour. But this is Communism, "impossible Communism." The more intelligent members of the ruling class who advocate cooperative production have to understand that cooperation superseding the Capitalist system, regulating national production upon a common plan, is synonymous with Communism.

The address sold quickly, and second and third editions followed. One of Marx's aims that the address achieved immediately was to confirm in the minds of the hostile bourgeoisie the International's parentage of the Commune and also the identification of the Commune with Communism. The address succeeded in resuscitating the specter of Communism, which had seemed exorcised through the substitution of such terms as *collectivism* or *social democracy*. Various newspapers and journals attacked the foreign influences within the London leadership of the International. Only a minority among the educated class dissented from that condemnation, the most courageous being the two positivist workers' friends, Beesly and Harrison.

The Times and other newspapers published the circular of Jules Favre, the French foreign minister, who appealed to European countries for a concerted action against the International. Favre included in the circular the statutes of the Geneva alliance, exploiting to the full its open declaration of "atheism." In its issue of 13 June, *The Times* published a letter signed by John Hales, the new general secretary of the London council. The letter had the hallmark of Marx's style and strongly reflected his concerns of that time. It rejected all responsibility of the International for the alliance. In 1869, the General Council had declared the original statutes of the alliance null and void. The letter concentrated on the author of the circular and the scandals surrounding him.⁷

Some members of the British press directed their wrath against two English members of the General Council, Odger and Lucraft, whose names appeared under the address. Their names appeared in the first edition but not in the second and third. The circumstances of these changes are interesting. For a long time, Odger was only a nominal member of the council, and Lucraft's participation in the council, once so active, became increasingly sporadic. Both were active in the movement to support the new republic of France. The British leaders of that

movement were in contact with Jules Favre. Odger and Lucraft were absent from the council's meeting at which the text of the address was adopted. A little earlier, Odger acknowledged that he was still a member of the council, but insisted on reading the address first, before he would give his approval. As for Lucraft, his membership was unquestioned and his permission was not sought, as it was usual to append all the names under documents of this kind. However, two names of council members were omitted at their own request.⁸ Eventually, Odger and Lucraft resigned from the General Council and that signalled their departure from the International. Of all the British cofounders of the International there remained only one: Eccarius.

London became the refuge of hundreds of people fleeing from Paris. Despite the agitation by many members of the press, the bulk of public and government opinion favored the granting of the right of asylum to the refugees. The Home Office welcomed the receipt of various documents provided by the General Council, and on that basis it distanced itself from the Continental initiatives to persecute the International. A memorandum was handed to the German envoy in London, which, while admitting that many members of the International, in particular the French and Germans, adhered to revolutionary doctrines, insisted that these were not the official doctrines of the association. In England workers were mainly concerned with questions of work and pay and only a very few subscribed to revolution.⁹

The attitude of the British authorities was in stark contrast to that of other powers. On 25 July Marx informed the General Council that the Pope condemned Switzerland for granting asylum to the "bad men" of Paris who fled there. Engels discussed at length the attacks against the Commune and the International, launched by the "antipope" Mazzini who, at one time, attempted to turn the International into his tool. The man whom he had sent to do his work at the beginning of the International was Major Wolff, now unmasked as a police spy. Engels repeated an allegation by Tibaldi, who had claimed to have found proofs in the secret files of the French police. The files were made accessible during the Commune, but later burned.¹⁰ Wolff, having returned to England, angrily denied that he was a spy.¹¹

The General Council decided to reply to the accusations both of the Pope and of his Italian adversary. Marx composed a leaflet, but its main thrust was directed against the American envoy in Paris for his hostile attitude to the Commune.¹² So, the offensive of the council on behalf of the Commune now reached the Western hemisphere.

The General Council created a fund to help the French refugees and requested contributions from many public figures. The Liberal member of Parliament, P.A. Taylor, one of Mazzini's friends, contributed the fairly large sum of £6, and his colleague in Parliament, Charles W. Kilke, gave £5. Of the council members, the first to come with a large contribution was Marx. He gave £10 in two instalments. He also handed over the sum of £50, offered by an anonymous

friend. Two guineas were given by Cowell Stepney to "General Rublewski" (Wróblewski, one of the Polish commanders of the Commune, now a refugee in England) in order to aid him in his intended journey to Galicia; that journey never materialized.¹³ Eventually, a special committee handled the financial help. Three weeks later, Jung, in the committee's name, informed the council that the funds at its disposal were nearly exhausted. Fresh appeals were made to members of Parliament. Little help was forthcoming from the trade unions and Engels condemned the English workers for behaving in a "disgraceful manner."¹⁴

The council's action stemmed not just from sentiments but also from more mundane considerations. The council endeavoured to bring the mass of the refugees in London under its wing and to save them from the embrace of the French branch, resuscitated by those who had survived and come back from France. During the summer a growing number of French refugees came to the meetings of the General Council. On 11 July sixteen council members and nineteen guests were present. One week later the respective figures were seventeen and twenty-three. Cooption seemed to be the proper way out of the arising chaos, but the difficulties increased. In the end, a fairly large number of Frenchmen made their way to the General Council. These were mostly known and recognized leaders of the French International and the Commune: Bastélica, Vaillant, Frankel, Longuet, Robin, Rochat, Theisz, Delahaye, Le Moussu, and Martin. They differed widely in their ideas and their loyalties: some of the Frenchmen were friends of Bakunin (Bastélica and Robin), some were Blanquists, and others came from a Proudhonist background or belonged to Varlin's circle. Members of other nationalities were also coopted. One of the candidates for cooption was Patrick J. MacDonnell, an Irish journalist and politician. He met with a strong opposition. Murphy, who worked for the journal *The Irishman*, attacked MacDonnell's reputation and integrity.¹⁵ MacDonnell defended himself in a long letter to Marx. He wanted "to bring within the folds of the Association the majority of the working men in Ireland." He praised his own capacities. "I am acquainted and have great influence with the working class and their representatives in Ireland," he wrote. His influence was as great, if not greater, with the intelligent Irish throughout England.¹⁶ Finally, he entered the council as Marx's friend and ally.

The General Council was undergoing a fast change of ideological complexity and of ethnic-national mix. The meeting of 29 August was attended by twenty-six members, which was double the average attendance in the pre-Commune period—on 30 August 1870, there had been only eight members present at the council's meeting. About half of the members were of the old vintage. At the meeting were ten Britons, nine Frenchmen, four Germans, one Belgian, one Hungarian, and one Swiss. More than at any time in the past, the council formed a mosaic of political and ideological segments. There was Marx with his loyal and influential band of supporters; Blanquists; friends of Bakunin; Proudhonists, mostly of the collectivist-syndicalist variety; one Owenite; and,

last but not least, the compact group of O'Brienites. Some members were without a clear loyalty. The recent dramatic events and the influx of the Commune veterans were beneficial to the council and enlivened its debates. Despite all the differences, there was a great concordance of spirits and even solid unanimity on most matters.

By now, Engels's stature within the council was comparable with that of Marx. The two friends controlled relations with other countries. Marx was the corresponding secretary for Germany, Russia (rather nominally), and also, at the time of the Commune, France; to that he added responsibility for a new country: Holland. Engels held for some time the office of Belgian secretary and later also that of secretary for Italy. Their close collaborators, Eccarius, Jung, and Serrailier, were respectively secretaries for the United States, Switzerland, and France (except when Serrailier was in France). In August the new member of the council, MacDonnell, became the secretary for Ireland. Marx lost one of his partisans, the Pole Zabicki, who left for Galicia. He soon found a new, even closer, friend: the Polish general of the Commune, Walery Wróblewski.

The spirit of camaraderie within the council did not totally eliminate conflicts and animosities that were not necessarily on grounds of principle. At a meeting on 11 October 1870 the general secretary Eccarius came under strong attacks. Hales pointed out that the secretary's salary was a large part of the council's income and, therefore, he proposed to reduce it to 5 shillings weekly. Boon stated that Eccarius had other sources of income resulting from his participation in the council, such as fees received for reports in *The Times*. Eccarius felt deeply offended. He received £21 for his reports on the last congress of the International in Basel, but he wrote them not for pecuniary gain but in order to serve the cause. There and then, he gave notice of his resignation from his post.¹⁷

Eccarius stepped down seven months later. John Hales, with five votes against four votes for Mottershead, was elected the new general secretary. He proposed to reduce his fee from 15 to 10 shillings (and not to 5 shillings, which he had previously proposed). This salary was accepted by a majority.¹⁸

Hales enjoyed Marx's support and became his close ally. Hales's letters to Marx, at that period, were full of consideration and flattery. He asked Marx for instructions, which he badly needed, and also urged him to make *Das Kapital* available in English. "I wish you could translate it. We sadly need a textbook in English," he wrote in a letter, dated 4 August.¹⁹ Hales was now able to use his position to revive his old plan of establishing an autonomous British organization of the International. He founded two branches in London: at Bethnal Green and at City Road. On Hales's initiative Buttery, Roach, and Taylor were coopted to the General Council as representatives of these branches. On 16 September Hales proposed to the council that these branches be authorized to initiate a London or perhaps a British, federal council. Mottershead strongly opposed it. There are no branches and no political movement and the working classes are apathetic, he said. A federal council for Britain would be a sham. Marx, who had so consistently opposed Hales's idea in the past, changed his position. He pro-

posed that the matter should be referred to the coming congress. This was accepted.²⁰

By almost an oversight the council coopted one of Bakunin's closest friends. Paul Robin, the ever-wandering revolutionary, arrived in London in October 1870 with his family. There he met Marx, who was most generous in giving him financial and other aid. Robin wrote later that he was unaware at that time of Marx's enmity towards Bakunin.²¹ Marx, in turn, was probably influenced by Lafargue's letter from Paris, dated 29 April 1870, which assured him that Robin was neither Bakunin's friend nor an intriguer.²² At the General Council's meeting of 8 November, Marx proposed coopting Robin, which was accepted unanimously. At the same meeting, Robin proposed to the council to call a conference of the International, which, he thought, was urgently desired by Socialists of various countries in order to coordinate their defense against reactionary governments. Marx was against the proposal. Engels thought that the time was not propitious for a conference, but such a time might come later. Robin's motion was defeated.²³

Some eight months later, Engels, acting in full agreement with Marx, became the champion of the idea of the conference, which he had opposed before. At the meeting of 25 July 1871, two months after the defeat of the Commune, Engels proposed that the General Council convene a "private conference" on the third Sunday of September. "Private" meant that the press and the general public would not be admitted to the sittings of the conference and its deliberations would be confidential. Engels excluded the possibility of a congress as long as the organizations of the International in Germany, France, Spain, and Belgium suffered persecution; Switzerland could not be taken into account because of the internal conflict within the organization there. Robin supported the idea that was originally his own. The General Council sanctioned the proposal and delegated the preparations to the subcommittee, which had recently been reactivated.²⁴ In the two meetings of the subcommittee, on 9 and 11 September, Marx, Engels, Jung, Eccarius, Serrailier, Longuet, Hales, MacDonnell, and Mottershead participated. Only Mottershead was outside the circle of Marx's friends. The meetings were held either in Engels's or Marx's house.²⁵

The convening of a conference, instead of a congress, has its own history. In Spring 1870 the General Council was considering the question of the coming congress. On 17 May Marx proposed that the council transfer the place of the congress from Paris, where the persecutions of the regime made a congress impossible, to Mainz, following an invitation from the German Social Democrats. On 28 June Marx proposed unexpectedly to the General Council that the question of the seat of the council be discussed in the coming congress. Marx was in favor of transferring the council from London to Brussels. Marx had suspected for some time that Bakunin's friends would come to the congress with a proposal to establish the General Council in Paris, where Bakunin could impose his dictatorship over the International. The council's present proposal would make Bakunin's move abortive. At a congress in Germany "Bakunin and

company" would be totally powerless.²⁶ It was more than probable that the congress would reject any idea of a transfer and that the present General Council would emerge with greater strength and authority. Eventually, the council accepted Marx's proposal, but other events made the idea of a congress in the course of the coming months impossible.

Conflicts and pressures from particular organizations in the International were growing. Hins wrote to Marx from Brussels on 9 July 1871: "Nous considérons comme de toute nécessité que cette année-ci ne se passe sans Congrès."²⁷ Marx and Engels became converted to the idea of a conference, which, if held in London, would give them control and direction of its proceedings.

The conference was decided upon and London was the choice for the site. It was not clear what the powers of the General Council were in relation to the conference, despite the precedents of six years ago. At the meeting of 5 September Marx proposed that all members of the General Council had the right of participation, but that only a number of members be endowed with voting rights. The French members, so strongly represented in the council, felt threatened. When subsequently the council came to elect its six representatives to the conference, there were four Frenchmen among them: Serrailier, Bastélica, Varlin, and Frankel; the other two representatives were Mottershead and Jung.²⁸

The second conference of the International assembled on Sunday 16 September and concluded on Sunday 23 September 1871.²⁹ There were twenty-two participants with full rights and an indefinite number of members of the General Council who had no such rights. The official list contained thirteen members of the General Council and nine delegates from abroad. The London team included the six elected members and the seven corresponding secretaries, who were members of the conference by the right of their office. These were: Marx, the secretary for Germany; Engels, for Italy; Eccarius, for the United States; Cohn for Denmark; Hales for England; MacDonnell for Ireland; and Dupont for France. Six delegates came from Belgium: Coenen, Verrycken, De Paepe, Herman, Fluse, and Steens. Two delegates came from Switzerland: Perret and Utin. One delegate came from Spain: Lorenzo, a thirty-one-year-old printer. Utin and Lorenzo were newcomers to the gatherings of the International, but although Utin had gained a certain fame, if not notoriety, both inside and outside Switzerland, Lorenzo was only known in his own country.

The participation of Dupont in the conference was questionable. He was not the French secretary. Having settled in Manchester, he had ceased to participate in the work of the General Council and his membership in it had lapsed. The real French secretary was Serrailier, but being one of the elected delegates, he left room for Dupont, who strengthened Marx's group. Yet Dupont left the conference early to return home. Cohn, the Danish secretary, was totally absent, as he was preoccupied with other matters closer to his heart. Some Londoners who had to earn their daily bread were necessarily absent from many meetings. A number of participants, mostly French, did not have full rights: Martin, Rochat,

Delahaye, Robin, and Theisz, and the Irishman Milner. Martin, Rochat, and Delahaye functioned as the secretaries of the conference. The composition of the conference gave, once again, priority to the French language, which reduced the participation of English-speaking members.

The General Council proposed to the conference a program that included the following points: finance; organization of the International in countries in which it was persecuted; memorandum to governments; publication of a new authorized text of the statutes; and strengthening the powers of the General Council in agreement with the resolution taken by the last congress.³⁰ However, when the conference assembled, De Paepe, in the name of a commission, proposed to add two new points. One concerned the settlement of the conflict in Switzerland. The other point dealt with the "abuse of the Association's name in a famous political trial in Russia." It is probable that Utin, having arrived in London, suggested the inclusion of these two matters, and they were strongly supported by Marx and his friends.

When the conference came to discuss matters of organization, Marx proposed that councils or committees at the head of federations adopt the name Federal Council or Federal Committee, followed by the name of the country or the region. The same simplifications should apply to local organizations and any additions, such as "positivist," "mutualist," or "propaganda section," should be eliminated. "Sectarians" and "bourgeois charlatans" were, according to Marx, responsible for such designations. Despite some protests, Marx's motion was carried by the conference.

Most important matters emerged on the fourth day of the Conference and the two days following. During the morning session of 20 September, Vaillant, supported by Longuet and Martin, proposed a motion: "In the face of unrestrained reaction, temporarily triumphant," members of the International were reminded that the political question and the social question were insolubly united, being two sides of the question that the International attempted to resolve, that of the abolition of classes. The thrust of this motion was clear. Vaillant, in accordance with his Blanquist creed, turned against the remnants of Proudhonism and the new "abstentionists," who disregarded or even opposed the idea of struggle for political power. The discussion at the evening session of that day took on the character of an ideological debate. Lorenzo and Bastélica wanted to eliminate the discussion, as the conference was called to discuss matters of organization and not of principles. Bastélica went further and attacked workers' involvement in politics as a waste of their energies for the futile purpose of sending representatives to parliaments and local councils. Vaillant agreed, to a point, with Bastélica. He, too, was opposed to politics being reduced to petty agitation for seats in parliaments. These institutions must be destroyed. However, the politics of the International were Socialist in character and aimed at the abolition of a class society. De Paepe supported Bastélica in his criticism of parliamentary politics. Perret defended full participation in day-to-day political activities. Perret's view was supported by the Swiss Internationalists except

for a "small church" preaching abstentionism. It was right for workers to enter all representative bodies, so as to "gnaw at the bone of that old whore of society and speed its fall." Perret advocated the formation of workers' political parties.

Finally, Marx entered the arena. He launched a frontal attack on the concept of abstentionism and on its partisans. He defended participation in parliamentary elections and so declared his opposition to both Blanquists and Bakuninists. He cited the example of Bebel and Liebknecht, who used the parliamentary tribune to propagate their principles. The discussion continued the next day, and Engels was the first to speak. A working-class party existed in most countries, he said. Engels made it clear that the politics advocated by him must be proletarian politics and that the workers' party must constitute itself as a force independent of the bourgeoisie. And he added: "political liberties, the right of assembly and association, the freedom of the press are our weapons. Should we fold our arms and practice abstention when they want to take it from us?"

In the end, two motions were presented. The first, that of Bastélica and Verrycken, proposed leaving the whole matter to the next congress. The second, signed by Serrailier, Frankel, Perret, Utin, Hales, and Jung, demanded recognition of the political action carried out by proletarian parties, leaving the more precise formulation of that principle to the General Council. The first motion was supported by four votes out of eighteen; thirteen members voted against and one member abstained. The second motion, the "Marxian" motion, received ten votes for and two against, with five abstentions. The majority was composed of eight members of the General Council plus Utin and Perret. Voting against were not the "abstentionists," but Vaillant and Herman, who were dissatisfied with the rejection of Vaillant's original resolution.³¹

The next major matter was the conflict in Switzerland. A commission was elected at the beginning of the conference to examine that question. Its members were: Eccarius, MacDonnell, Vaillant, Verrycken, and Marx. The commission assembled on the second day of the Conference in Marx's Hampstead house, but others were also present. Perret and Utin represented one side of the quarrel, and Robin represented the other side. Bastélica and Lorenzo were also present. Engels functioned as the secretary, and Verrycken was the chair.³² Robin presented a letter from the Jura organization. In it the General Council was accused of deliberately withdrawing from the Jurassians an invitation to the conference. Shortage of time prevented the Jurassians from preparing a memorandum. They appealed to the spirit of equity of the conference members. For eighteen months, they complained, they had been treated like pariahs. The General Council lent its full authority to the Geneva organization and broke off its relations with a large part of the French-speaking Swiss. The Jurassians demanded recognition of their rights. They asked to leave the decision about the dispute in Switzerland to the next congress. The letter was signed in the name of "Comité fédéral Romand," by its secretary, Adhémar Schwitzguébel.³³

Marx attacked the charges made in the letter. Perret and Utin supported him. Robin, Bastélica, and Lorenzo were bound to assume the role of defenders.

Lorenzo knew little about the Swiss conflict and said very little, but he was filled with resentment against Marx and his supporters. He wrote later in his memoirs: "I assisted one evening in Marx's house at a meeting of a commission charged to report on the Alliance and I saw that man descending from the pedestal where my admiration and my respect placed him to the most vulgar level. Some of his partisans had fallen to even greater depths by practising adulation, as if they were vile courtiers facing their master."⁴⁴

The next day, Robin transmitted through Delahaye a declaration to the conference that he refused to serve any longer on the commission, where, instead of being a witness, he had become the accused.⁴⁵ Robin was also absent when Marx reported to the plenum of the conference the findings of the "Swiss" commission. None of those who participated in this plenary meeting attempted to side with the Jurassians or with the alliance. Utin accused Robin of being the instigator of the conflict and denounced the "arrogance" of his declaration. The commission proposed two resolutions, one on the question of the alliance and the second on the split in the French-speaking parts of Switzerland. The first resolution declared that the alliance had dissolved voluntarily, a fact that Zhukovski had communicated to the General Council in a letter dated 10 August 1871; therefore, that problem ceased to exist. As to the second matter, the protests of the Jura federal committee against the competence of the conference were declared invalid. The conference was invited to approve the resolution of the General Council of 29 June 1870 that had granted the title of the Romand Federal Committee to the Geneva camp. The "brave workers" of the Jura sections were invited to join that federation. If, however, they felt disinclined to do so and decided to go their own way, the conference advised the adoption of the title: *Fédération Jurassienne*. The resolution also criticized *Progrès* and *Solidarité* for discussing before a bourgeois public internal questions of the International, reserved for debates within the organizations and institutions of the International.⁴⁶ The two resolutions were passed unanimously.

Bakunin was strongly criticized at the meetings of the commission, but not a word was said about him in the "Swiss" resolutions. This changed when on 22 September the "Russian question" was discussed. Utin initiated an attack on Bakunin. He had abused the name of the International on Russian soil. Utin denied that any secret societies were needed in Russia. Marx concurred, but he and others avoided Bakunin's name in the discussion. The Russian question emerged again toward the end of the conference and Utin was the main speaker. He referred to the Nechaev affair as "that conspiracy of Bakunin." In 1840 Bakunin had left Russia as all the noble viveurs [aristocratic pleasure seekers] had always done, and so he became totally ignorant of Russian affairs, Utin said. He was one of the *bons vivants* who loved to discuss German philosophy over a glass of champagne. In such a style Utin arrived at the story of Bakunin and Nechaev and the murder of Ivanov. One day, Utin said, Ivanov had declared that he did not wish to obey either Bakunin or Nechaev any more. That sealed his fate. Among Utin's accusations were those of police provocation, of funds being

obtained by Bakunin from Tsarist sources, of Bakunin's authorship of the damaging and discredited catechism, and so on.

De Paepe expressed his displeasure with Utin's report. He regretted that Bakunin or one of his friends could not reply to the accusations. The conference should simply declare that the International had nothing to do with the activities of Nechaev. Marx concurred with De Paepe's sentiments: Bakunin could not be condemned without hearing his defense. With Marx's support De Paepe's proposal was accepted unanimously. Marx also proposed that Utin be charged with the task of providing a dossier on the Ivanov murder trial, and this proposal was accepted.

Another matter raised quite a sensation. Marx proposed that the conference sanction the creation of a federal council for England. He had been opposed to it in the past because the English workers had to be inspired first by a Socialist and internationalist spirit. This task, Marx said, had been achieved. Utin expressed some skepticism. Marx assured the conference that the General Council would always be in a position to master any emergency. He also expressed the hope that some English members of the General Council, who were perhaps superfluous on the council, would find for themselves a proper field of activity within the federal council. This proposal was also accepted unanimously.

Various other matters were settled in the last hours of the conference. One of them concerned the membership and the national composition of the General Council. De Paepe, speaking in the name of the Belgian delegation, proposed that each nationality be represented by two or three members. He aired his concern that the General Council might be flooded by refugees from Paris. After a stormy discussion, the conference agreed on the principle of maintaining a balance of national elements within the General Council and also of carefully examining the moral qualifications of a candidate before deciding on his cooption. Yet all the cooptions of the Parisian refugees were ratified as a homage to the Commune.

The conference charged the General Council with the task of publishing a report of the conference proceedings, which, however, would include those extracts from the minutes and only those resolutions that the council would judge appropriate. The General Council was also charged with choosing the date and the place of the next congress. Utin took the floor once again and proposed recognizing the conference as having the force of a Congress. This met, however, with strong opposition and, despite Engels's support, was rejected.

Judging the course of the conference and its results, it is fair to assume that its importance in the history of the International transcended that of some past congresses. What emerged clearly at the conference was the gulf between the Marxian and Bakuninian groups. For the first time and at an international gathering, the power and authority exercised by Marx became fully evident. Marx had the opportunity to demonstrate his great political skills. Helped by Engels, he mustered the support and loyalty of other members of the General Council and won the sympathy of the Continental delegates or neutralized and disarmed

those who were in the enemy camp. The delegate who stole the show was Utin. Agile and energetic, he proved his talents and his expertise, which went far beyond Russian and Swiss affairs. De Paepe's star seemed to be fading; he was indecisive and easily succumbed to pressure. Léo Frankel was another newcomer who captured the general attention. Utin and Frankel represented the Swiss and French elements with which they were identified, but, even more, the unawakened oppressed masses of Eastern Europe. They were prototypes of a significant and growing segment of Jewish youth and intellectuals joining, serving, and often leading these masses.

After the conference, the General Council, at its meeting of 6 October, delegated to several committees the editing of the resolutions of the conference. Marx and Engels, who played the greatest roles in initiating the resolutions of the conference, also had the decisive roles in their final phrasing. This gave the published resolutions the full imprint of their style and their ideas. Of the greatest importance was the phrasing of resolution No. 9 on the "political action of the working class." Marx gained the opportunity to refine the text accepted by the conference. He drew attention to the principles enunciated in the inaugural address and the statutes, in particular the principle that the economic emancipation of the working class, being the main aim of the International, must subordinate to itself every political movement as a means (and not as in texts perverted through omitting *as a means*, which pushed political action into insignificance and played into the hands of the abstentionists). Against the collective power of the possessing classes, the working class was urged to constitute itself into a "distinct political party, opposed to all the old parties, formed by the possessing classes. Such constitution of the proletariat into a political party was indispensable to assure the triumph of the social revolution and its supreme aim: abolition of classes." This resolution, fully formulated and sanctioned only three weeks after the conclusion of the conference, could be seen as its most important result, although the "Swiss" resolution had a more explosive effect immediately.

The texts of the resolutions appeared as a brochure in English and then in translations in various press organs in Germany, Switzerland, Belgium, Spain, and Italy.³⁶ It is noticeable that, even before the publication of the English text, the Geneva *L'Égalité* printed an extract, the resolution on the conflict in French-speaking parts of Switzerland. Karl Marx was presented as the author of that resolution. The text published in Geneva was incomparably longer than the one in the official English brochure. It included all the details and engaged in polemics against the Jura faction. We may suppose that Marx's name was used with his permission.

Marx's complete success at the conference had immediate repercussions within the General Council. The balance of power and influence, which had rested in the few months before the Conference on a coalition of, and compromise between, various groups and tendencies, tilted in favor of the Marxian tendency, stronger now than at any time before. By force of circumstances, some French members—Bastélica, Theisz, Chalain, and Robin—formed an op-

position. The General Council began to deal with the case of Robin's part in the conference. A motion was proposed to dismiss him from the council. When the motion came to a vote, on 17 October, out of twenty-six members present five voted for his dismissal and four against; the majority of members present abstained. Bastélica and Theisz, in solidarity with Robin, withdrew from the council. Soon, Chalain followed in their steps. By the end of October, the French opposition had disappeared from the council. Some time passed before the repercussions of the London conference began to be heard in the various countries of the European continent and also in North America.

The "Latin" Rebellion

The success achieved by the Marxian faction at the London conference was only of a limited duration. The course of the conference and some of the resolutions caused anger and dismay in various circles. Antagonisms deepened and they erupted more openly than before. The political differences closely matched the geographical divisions. The leadership in London had to contend with opposition and growing rebellion in most areas where the Latin languages—French, Spanish, and Italian—were spoken.

After England, Switzerland hosted the largest contingent of refugees from Paris. The Swiss government, like the British, refused to participate in any concerted action against the International.¹ The influx from France had, at first, a beneficial effect on the Swiss International, but differences of views, experiences, and temperaments were bound to emerge. A strong refugee contingent settled in Geneva. It included two prominent members of the Commune, Benoît Malon and Gustave Lafrançais. They were assisted by Jules Guesde, a young journalist from Montpellier, Léonie Champseix, who used the pseudonym "André Léo," Aristide Claris, and others. Most of them joined the central section, which was the backbone of the *Fédération Romande*, but they found little interest by the *fabrique* in their revolutionary ideas and concerns for worldwide matters. According to Claris, they expected to find sympathy and cordiality, but they were met with coldness and contempt.² Becker, who originally used all his energy for the refugees, soon developed an acute antipathy towards them. In a letter to Sorge, he accused the Commune refugees in Geneva of loud-mouthed arrogance and hotheaded chauvinism.³ Marc Vuilleumier comments: "Le patriotisme et le messianisme jacobin des Français se heurtaient au senti-

ment national des internationaux suisses."⁴ Claris wrote: "Le plus grand coupable dans tout cela, c'est Karl Marx."⁵

The Communards soon constituted themselves into a section of propaganda and revolutionary action. They found an ally in Zhukovski, Bakunin's close friend, and through him they established relations with the Jura Internationalists. The Fédération Romande rejected the application of their section for membership and the General Council confirmed this decision. It was now fairly easy to recruit them into the opposition against London. To Becker's denunciations of their French "chauvinism," they replied with accusations of "Pan-Germanism," which put them in line with Jura and Bakunin. The refugee section gained in importance when it began to publish a newspaper of its own, *La Révolution Sociale*.

The Jura leaders reacted with vehemence to the London resolutions, in particular the one concerning the Swiss conflict. Adhémar Schwitzguébel, the secretary of the "Romand Federal Committee" (the name still held by the Jura association), circulated a letter to its sections in which he denounced the dictatorial attitude of the General Council and accused the conference of having passed decrees contrary to the fundamental principles of the International.

A congress of the Jura sections was scheduled to be held in Sonvillier on 12 November.⁶ Of the twenty sections adhering to the Jura camp, only eight took part in the congress; the ninth participant was the Geneva section of French refugees. Despite its opposition to the London conference, the congress accepted the recommendation to change the name of the organization to "Jura Federation." The main resolution of the congress, whose author was Guillaume, challenged the authority of the General Council. Addressed as a "circular" to all the organizations of the International, it demanded joint action in favor of a congress to be held within a short space of time.⁷ The General Council, the circular proclaimed, had to perform the functions of a central correspondence bureau between sections without holding any authority; such an authority being contrary to the very essence of the International, which was "an immense protest against authority." It had been proved a thousand times by experience that authority corrupted those who wielded it. "It is absolutely impossible for anyone to have power over his fellow-men and remain a moral man." The General Council could not escape that fatal law. For five years it was composed of the same men, constantly reelected at the congresses, though the majority of them were unknown to the delegates. They thought it their right to impose on the International their particular set of ideas and their personal doctrine. Under these circumstances, the General Council must meet with opposition and, in turn, must endeavour to break that opposition. The council became a group of schemers. This was bound to lead to an open war.

The circular tried to identify the ideological roots of the existing differences. It said that motivated by good faith and the desire to make one particular doctrine triumphant, the leading personalities of the London council were determined to introduce into the association the principle of authority. It seemed

quite natural that the school whose ideal was the "conquest of political power by the working class" believed that the International ought to change from its original form into a hierarchical organization, directed and governed from above. In the name of social revolution and the principle of self-emancipation of the working class, the delegates present at the Jura congress demanded the maintenance of the autonomy of the sections and the return of the General Council to its "normal role" of a bureau of correspondence and statistics. A structure of the International as a free federation of autonomous groups would be universalized in the society of the future. "How would one want an egalitarian and free society to emerge from an authoritarian organisation? That is impossible." Though the Jura congress followed the decision of the hated London conference by changing the name of the federation, the old names of sections, such as "circle of social studies" or "section of propaganda" were retained in the signature under this elaborate resolution, which was turned into a circular.

What strikes one in this text is its authors' willingness to interpret the conflict within the International in wide sociological and ideological terms and not through the spectrum of individual characters. It would seem that such a method was bound to create a deeper impression and even to gain acceptance within the various organizations of the International than slander and abuse of individuals would have. Yet the Jurassians were opposed immediately by the established Geneva center. The recently constituted center in Zurich sided with Geneva. Marx and Engels in their numerous letters assured all that the forces of the adversaries were insignificant and that the great majority of the International was on the side of the General Council. In fact, under cover of such self-assurance they were apprehensive. The two friends decided to answer the Jura circular. A text, equal in size to the address on the civil war in France, was issued from their joint pen and presented to the General Council on 5 March 1872. As the text had to be published in French, Marx brought to the meeting the French version, entitled *Les prétendus scissions dans l'Internationale*.⁸ Maintaining that its theme was the historical development of principles and policies of the association, Marx summarized its main points to the meeting. The only person present who expressed some doubts was a new member of the council, Maltman Barry. He admitted his ignorance of the French language and refused to append his name to a document whose text was incomprehensible to him. Though similar doubts must have occurred to others, Barry found no support and the text was approved.⁹

This new address was given the character of a private and confidential letter, to be circulated only within the association. It was directed against "those few intriguers" who consciously attempted to promote confusion in agreement with the bourgeois press and even with the international police. Behind these intrigues stood the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy, whose spiritus movens was the Russian Bakunin. The address went into various, mostly discrediting, details concerning Bakunin and the alliance. The story of the application for membership of the International, the Nechaev affair, and the conflicts in

Switzerland were all told with punch and venom. Only towards the end and in a few sentences was an effort made to consider the struggle in the International in terms of opposed systems of ideas. It concerned the concepts of anarchy and anarchism. The address stated that all socialists see in anarchy the disappearance of state power as a result of the abolition of classes, which is the proper aim of the proletarian movement. However, the alliance proclaims anarchy within the ranks of the proletarians as a means by which to break the great and concentrated power, social and political, held by the exploiters. The alliance demands of the International the replacement of its organization by anarchy. And this is postulated at a time when the old world does everything to destroy the IWMA. Nothing more is desired by the international police.

The tone and contents of the London circular did not find general support even among adversaries of the Jurassians. Remy, a former member of the alliance and now Bakunin's adversary, criticized it in his letter to Jung of 12 August 1872. He wrote: "Bakounine s'était presque anéanti à Genève; avec votre pamphlet vous lui rendu la vie."¹⁰ The opponents did not remain silent. The *Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne*, which replaced *La Révolution Sociale*, published successively a number of "answers," soon to be collected into a pamphlet.¹¹ Included were texts written by Teulière, Malon, Bakunin, Claris, and Guillaume. An important feature of these texts were personal attacks on Marx. Malon denounced him as a bourgeois from "villa Modena" (the name of Marx's family house in Hampstead) who had never experienced hunger, lacked shelter, or toiled under a foreman's rude insults. "While we work painfully 10 or 12 hours per day to earn bread, they make, between one meal and another, plans of direction, send emissaries, search for partisans, launch into adventures." According to Guillaume, Marx had never risked his skin in any revolutionary movement. He "smoked his cigarettes in his London cottage, while many of those whom he insults in his brochure fought in Paris and elsewhere." Guillaume also attacked Marx, in a different piece of writing, for not being a true materialist and follower of the experimental method. "He had habits of thought which seem to have remained with him from the Hegelian school."¹² Guillaume also attacked Perret and Coullery and in particular Utin, the "flattest of Marx's Jewish lackeys." Anti-Semitism became an important weapon in the anti-Marxist campaign. Even thirty-five years later, Guillaume still stressed that the pro-Marx and anti-Bakunin party of that time consisted of Jews. He counted among them: Utin, Hess, Frankel, Borkheim, Hepner, and Dimitrieva-Tomanovskaya. He observed, however, the paradox that "nowadays" Bakunin became the object of a true cult among Russian Jews.¹³

Bakunin, in his contribution, was firing with even heavier guns. The London circular was a collection of ridiculous inventions, cynical lies, and infamous calumnies. It was composed of "all the absurd and dirty tales which the wickedness, more perverse than spiritual, of German and Russian Jews, their friends, their agents, their disciples and, at the same time, valets" have propagated against Bakunin and his friends. He gave notice that he would appeal to the next

congress and also of his intention to publish a treatise destroying the system of lies erected by Marx and his acolytes. About the same time Bakunin wrote another text, which remained unpublished. It was entitled "*Aux compagnons de la Fédération des sections internationales de Jura.*" He attacked Utin ("the little Russian Jew, impudent liar and shameless intriguer"), Marx, and other German Jews who had become a true power in Germany.¹⁴

Earlier, Bakunin wrote an article for *Révolution Sociale*. As the paper had ceased publication, the article remained handwritten. It was, by comparison, moderate in tone. The merits of the "German party" for the International were recognized. Yet the German working class, because of its "historical instincts" gravitated towards authoritarian Communism; the revolt, "the daughter of Satan and mother of all liberty," being more infused into the blood of Latin and Slav races than into that of Germans.¹⁵

Suddenly a quarrel erupted between Becker and Perret in Geneva. It concerned the intended revision of the Swiss constitution. While Perret was against such revision, which would have strengthened the central authority of the Swiss confederation, Becker supported it. Perret accused his old comrade of being "imbu du pangermanisme." It must be said that Becker himself fueled such accusations. He took the cue from Marx in his struggle against "Panslavism," but went much further. On one occasion, he reproached the Polish, the Czech, and other national movements inside Germany and Austria for not being attached any longer to the aspirations of political freedom and social equality. Therefore, these movements, "consciously or unconsciously, give important support to Panslavism and by it to reaction and to political, religious and social despotism in all its forms."¹⁶

The quarrel between the German- and French-speaking members of the International in Geneva gave temporary succour to the Jurassians. It also fertilized Bakunin's thought, leading him to an even greater precision in grasping Marxian "State Socialism" in all its evil consequences. In another paper of those days he warned that working-class emancipation "through the State, the States, a number of large States," each one tending to develop its greatness, would result in a fatal struggle of nations, that is, in a most complete and bloody negation of humanity. The Latin, German, and Slav races would engage in a mortal struggle to decide which should conquer, enslave, exterminate, or absorb the other. Militarism would be triumphant and whole populations would be turned into permanent armies.¹⁷ This paper, like some others, remained unprinted, yet it reflected the ever sharpening concepts, ideas, and arguments with which Bakunin and his friends armed themselves for the coming, decisive struggles against the authority in London.

The Jurassians received support from a newly formed "Slav section," which constituted itself in Zurich. It consisted mostly of Russian students, the majority of whom were followers of Bakunin. The Jurassians, unexpectedly, had gained a foothold in the enemy territory.¹⁸ At the same time, the Geneva party boasted of gaining ground in the Jura, where the remaining followers of Coullery became

the party's allies. At the annual congress of the Fédération Romande in Vevey on 2 June 1872 general progress was reported, to the delight of the delegates. As many as twenty-six sections were listed in Geneva, of which twenty-one were trade sections.¹⁹ In July 1871, *L'Égalité* boasted that the International throughout the world numbered "millions of men and women . . . Millions, if we count our official force."²⁰ A part of these millions must have been in the traditional Swiss stronghold. Yet a year later, and two months after the Vevey Congress, the Geneva leaders, protesting against the Jura faction, complained that it had become their duty "to save the little that remained of the International in Geneva."²¹ One realizes how unreliable were the various statistical data given by the organs and organizations of the International. Guillaume, in his history of the International, maintained that most sections in Geneva existed on paper only. This testimony must, of course, be taken with a pinch of salt.²²

The Jura federation, which should have thrived on the sympathy engendered by the widely publicized outrages committed against it, was divided by squabbles. Zhukovski complained in a letter to Schwitzguébel that within the section of propaganda and revolutionary action in Geneva "un parti tout jeune" came out with a demand that the next congress of the International be turned into a constituent assembly, charged to organize the social revolution. Schwitzguébel in his reply blamed "the atmosphere of hatred and personal animosities." He saw a way out of the impasse in a federation of syndical bodies, able to conduct economic struggles that would lead to a social revolution. Schwitzguébel reached the position of revolutionary syndicalism, already strong in France and Belgium, but not quite in line with Bakunin's ideas. According to Nettlau, who interviewed Schwitzguébel some twenty years later, Bakunin reproached his erstwhile partisan: "Schwitz, you are not an Anarchist any more."²³

Lively and dangerous centers of opposition to London began to develop in the southern peninsulas. Until 1868, there were no real sections of the International in Italy. Bakunin had friends in various places in Italy at one time or another, but most of them had vanished from his magic circle.²⁴ When Bakunin formed his alliance in Geneva, he registered among its members three Italians whom he considered to be his partisans: Giuseppe Fanelli, a member of the Italian Parliament from 1865; Carlo Gambuzzi, a solicitor; and Saviero Friscia, a medical doctor. Subsequently, more Italians were recruited. Naples was the stronghold of Bakunin's party and a "mechanics section" gave him a delegate's mandate from that city for the Basel congress. The other mandate from Naples, in the name of a "central section," was held by Stefano Caporusso, a tailor by trade. The General Council in London learned only from a note in *L'Égalité* of 23 February 1869 that such a section had been formed. Caporusso became the president of that section's committee, which usurped to itself the role of a provisional central committee for the whole of Italy. Two carpenters and a dress designer were the other members of the committee in Naples. The activities of these men "were causing much alarm amongst middle-class Liberals," Jung reported approvingly to the General Council.²⁵

Most of the news from Italy was reaching London indirectly. Only at the end of 1870 was direct contact established. Carlo Cafiero, a young enthusiast of aristocratic origin, came to London and paid visits to both Marx and Engels. Back in Italy, he acted as an emissary of the General Council, for which he was twice arrested by the police. In the meantime, the Naples organization underwent a purge. Caporusso was accused of misappropriating the sum of 300 liras and, consequently, was removed from the section. Cafiero dutifully informed Engels. In his new role of the corresponding secretary for Italy, Engels received the news with satisfaction. He was also pleasantly surprised by Cafiero's assurance that there was no Bakuninist section in Naples.²⁶

Engels found another "agent": Theodor Cuno. He was Swiss by birth and a machine-construction engineer by profession. In March 1871 Cuno settled in Milan. During his earlier stay in Vienna, he had been active in working-class circles and he now tried, with the help of the General Council, to establish a liaison with members of the International in Milan. Engels wrote him that the only contact he had in Milan was with the paper *Gazzettino Rosa*, which was evolving from Marxinism towards Socialism and which was publishing various documents of the International supplied from London. Cuno was encouraged by Engels to initiate contacts of his own. Engels attached particular importance to Milan and to Lombardy. He told Cuno: "The movement, in an international sense, had erupted in Italy so suddenly and unexpectedly that all is very disorganised and, as you know, the Mardochians [police agents] do everything to obstruct the organisation."²⁷

The effervescence of the International in Italy is explained by the wider circumstances of the time. Italy was finally united. Liberated Rome became the capital of the country. The Republicans suffered their final defeat, which resulted in splits among them and also in the decline of Mazzini's prestige and popularity. The events in France deepened the conflicts within the Republican camp. Many sided with the Commune. Garibaldi openly expressed his sympathy for the Commune and the International, though he was opposed to Socialism. Mazzini issued a manifesto to Italian workers in which he strongly attacked the Communards and also the International as an organization that threatened to destroy all order in society. The International, he maintained, was ruled by a council whose soul was Karl Marx, a man of talent, but also of a destructive nature, imposing his authority on other men. Mazzini criticized what he thought to be the principles of the International: negation of God, negation of fatherland, and negation of property.²⁸

Mazzini's manifesto, published in his influential *Roma del Popolo*, of 13 June 1871, gained wide currency in Italy and abroad. Engels, in his role of the Italian secretary, wrote a reply to Mazzini's attacks, which, with the help of Cafiero, was published in *Libero Pensiero*, *Gazzettino Rosa*, and some other newspapers. His extremely short text hardly dealt with Mazzini's arguments, but concentrated on the past efforts of the Mazzinians to take control of the IWMA. It dealt

also with other matters, such as the position of Karl Marx, the departure of Odger and Lucraft from the General Council, and similar topics.²⁹

It is hard to imagine that Engels's article made any impression. In addition, it appeared two weeks after Bakunin published his own answer to Mazzini in *Gazzettino Rosa*. His article presented a magnificent defense of the Commune, a matter ignored in Engels's reply. Bakunin soon enlarged his article into a brochure entitled *The Political Theology of Mazzini and the International*, published in French by Guillaume.³⁰ Bakunin criticized his opponent's views, formulating at the same time the principles of his own theory of society, which he claimed was derived from the philosophy of materialism. He did not hesitate to pay homage to Marx's services for the cause and to his scholarship. Toward the end of the brochure he addressed the obsessive problem of relations between Slavs and Germans. He suggested to the General Council of the International that it instruct the German Social Democrats to recognize "full freedom for all Slav nationalities." Should the General Council refuse to do it, it would prove that it was led by Germans, that it understood the principles of justice and humanity only if they were not in opposition to the exaggerated intentions of the ambitious and conceited Germans.

While Bakunin's influence in Italy was limited so far to a few personal friends and small groups of people in a few places, his answer to Mazzini, in particular his powerful apologia of the Commune and the International, earned him the admiration and enthusiasm of vast radical circles in the whole of the country. His name became famous. He inspired, or perhaps was the author³¹ of the manifesto to the Workers' congress, called in Rome for the first days of November 1871. This congress became the field of battle between the partisans of Mazzini and their opponents—partisans of international Socialism. Only with great difficulty could the Mazzinists maintain their leadership. The opposition consisted mostly of those who shared Bakunin's views.

Engel's next article, in the form of a letter to the editor, was published in Mazzini's own paper, *Roma del Popolo* of 21 December 1871. In appearance, it was another reply to Mazzini, but its main object of attack was not Mazzini, but Bakunin.³²

In various places in Italy groups crystallized within workers' associations, seeking to come within the fold of the International. In December 1871 a group calling itself *Circolo Operaio di Emanzipazione del Proletario* was formed in Milan. Having applied to the General Council, they were admitted as a section on 30 January 1872. The group's secretary was Cuno, but he soon left Milan and his place was taken by Mauro Gandolfi, a merchant or traveling agent by trade. His sympathies, unlike those of Cuno, were on the side of Bakunin. Cuno tried to recruit into the International the *Società Democratica Internazionale* in Florence, but failed. In that city, the journal *Libero Pensiero*, which had only recently printed Engels's reply to Mazzini, now turned against the London Council.

In Turin an organization called L'Emancipazione del Proletario was formed. It declared its adherence to the IWMA and sent a contribution of 20 liras. Its secretary was the young lawyer Carlo Terzaghi. He began publishing a journal under the title *Proletario*, but lacking funds he appealed to the General Council. Engels wrote him a frank letter: "We have only very little money and the millions of the International exist only in the fearful imagination of the bourgeoisie and the police; they could not imagine that an Association such as ours could gain importance without great quantities of money going into millions." Engels himself was prepared to contribute the sum of £5 as payment for shares to be issued in his name. Before he posted his letter, Engels found out that Terzaghi had sided with Bakunin and the Jura leaders. He, therefore, wrote another letter informing Terzaghi of his original intention to contribute money, which, however, he had decided not to do because Terzaghi had joined the "party of the accusers." The letter concluded: "Salute and fraternity, Yours F. Engels."³³

There were no contacts between the General Council and the Fascio Operaio in Bologna, which considered itself a section of the International. It organized a congress of similar groups in the province of Romagna. The congress was held in March 1872 and was attended by delegates from Bologna, Turin, Naples, Genua, Mantua, and Miranda. A resolution was passed that recognized both the "General Committee" in London and the Jura committee as nothing but simple "correspondence and statistics bureaux." The "consulate" in Bologna, that is, Fascio Operaio, was instructed to establish contact with both centers and report to the sections. A decision was taken also to assemble a national congress of all sections of the International in Italy.

Bakunin had obvious reasons for delight. He attempted to explain the deeper causes of this new phenomenon in Italy in a letter to Francisco Mora, one of the leaders of the International in Spain. Referring to the recent upsurge in Italy of the International and of "our dear Alliance," Bakunin gave the following explanation: "The people on the land and in the towns find themselves in a fully revolutionary, i.e. economically desperate, situation, the masses begin to organise in a very serious manner, their interests begin to become ideas." Italy possessed what other countries lacked—an enthusiastic youth, which, despite their bourgeois provenance, were not exhausted morally and intellectually. Therefore, they were ready to embrace revolutionary Socialism and the program of the alliance.³⁴

Writing a little earlier, on 11 March 1872, to Laura Lafargue, Engels gave a contrasting interpretation of the Italian situation. Journalists, lawyers, and medical doctors pushed themselves forward, and the authority in London could not establish any direct links with workers. This, however, began to change and the workers proved to be of a different caliber from their middle-class spokesmen.³⁵ Yet Engels's optimism proved to be unfounded. In Summer 1872, the balance of forces in Italy was decisively unfavorable to the General Council. The council recognized, so far, only five sections, while in numerous places there existed

groups claiming to be sections of the International that had no ties with London and that gave their support to Bakunin.

Engels suffered a serious blow when Cafiero broke with him and went over to the adversaries' camp. The letters that Cafiero received from London disgusted him and speeded his change of heart. He handed one or more of these letters to Bakunin, who very soon included Cafiero in his close circle. The conference of the sections opposed to London, organized as an "Italian Federation," took place in Rimini from 4 to 6 August 1872. It was presided over by Cafiero. The conference declared its opposition to the resolutions of the London conference. In particular, it rejected resolution No. 9 on "political action," which was destined to subject the International to an authoritarian doctrine, that of the "German Communist party." The General Council was condemned for using foul means and for its "reactionary spirit." In consequence, the group decided to boycott the general congress to be assembled under the aegis of the General Council and, instead, to take part in the antiauthoritarian congress to be convened in Neuchâtel. It was a serious setback for Marx and his followers, though eventually they profited from this withdrawal.³⁶

The other new territory in which the International expanded was Spain. Throughout the 1860s Spain was within the orbit of the worldwide upsurge of working-class movements. France, in particular the center in Marseilles, exerted a direct influence on workers in Spain. However, the main stimuli came from international developments. The revolution of 1868 overthrew the Bourbon rule and absolutism. It began with a military uprising and eventually brought to power the alliance of monarchist Liberals and Republicans. A constitutional monarchy was proclaimed, and it guaranteed full liberties to the nation.

Madrid and Barcelona became the centers of the rising labor movement. Followers of various Socialist doctrines, Fourier and Proudhon in particular, were active in Spain for decades. They inspired the foundation of workers' cooperatives. Promoters and leaders of workers' associations and cooperatives were often in contact with Republican and free-thinking circles. The revolution drew them into the main stream of politics. In December 1868 a Workers' congress was held in Barcelona. It voted in favor of a democratic and federal republic. In Madrid and elsewhere, some groups within the Republican party, in particular young intellectuals, were becoming overtly Socialist.

The IWMA had, so far, only loose ties with Spain. In March 1866, the post of corresponding secretary for Spain was created within the General Council and Paul Lafargue was appointed to it because of his mastery of Spanish. There was one Spaniard at the Brussels congress of 1868, Antonio y Anglosa, disguised under the pseudonym of Sarro Magallan. He was not a delegate of any section, as sections did not exist at that time in Spain, but he was listed as a delegate of workers' societies in Catalonia; he also spoke in their name.

The revolution in Spain broke out on 18 September 1868, five days after the conclusion of the congress in Brussels. Some time later, Giuseppe Fanelli came to Spain. This forty-two-year-old Italian, a member of the Italian Parliament

since 1865 and once a Mazzinian, became, as we know, a close friend of Bakunin. He left the League of Peace and Freedom with Bakunin and others to form the International Alliance of Socialist Democracy. Fanelli came to Madrid as the representative of the new organization, and his mission was to recruit adherents. The fruit of his labor was the formation of Nucleo provisional fundador de la Asociación Internacional.³⁷

Nucleo's chief leader was Tomás Morago. He entered into direct relations with Bakunin and became a nominal member of the alliance. Morago was instructed by correspondence not to engage in conventional politics, but to adopt "destructive politics," aiming to replace the existing social order by a new one based on absolute equality that would guarantee to the worker the full enjoyment of the fruits of his labor.³⁸ Morago's closest friends were Anselmo Lorenzo, a typesetter by trade, and the two brothers, Angel and Francisco Mora, a carpenter and a shoemaker respectively. Lafargue, writing on 2 October 1871 to Engels, described Francisco Mora, with some admiration, as a man who at the age of eighteen could not yet read or write.³⁹ Fanelli was also successful in Barcelona. The chief recruit there was Doctor Gaspard Sentiñón. On the recommendations of Bakunin and Robin, he was accepted into the alliance during his stay in Geneva. He soon participated in the Basel congress, holding mandates from the "international section" in Barcelona and also from the Alliance of Socialist Democracy. The other Catalan present at that congress was Rafael Farga-Pellicer, mandated by the federal center of workers' associations in Catalonia. Sentiñón maintained amicable relations with Bakunin, Guillaume, and Becker. He was a skilled linguist and he corresponded with Becker in German on confidential matters concerning the alliance.⁴⁰

The newly established centers of the alliance in Spain accepted guidance from Geneva. In April 1870 Sentiñón and Farga-Pellicer founded an organization called Alianza de la Democracia Socialista. Despite the similarity of name, the Spanish organization was not a branch of the Geneva alliance, and it could not be, yet its statutes and declaration of principles were inspired by the alliance. Alianza declared itself a "strictly secret" body and adopted a discipline that compelled minority views to bow to the majority. The various groups forming Alianza were declared to be autonomous, though the struggle against the moderates within the budding workers' movement led to a certain amount of cohesion.

A workers' congress gathered in Barcelona on 19 June 1870. Representatives of trade and cooperative associations from various places attended. According to Nettlau, ninety delegates represented 150 societies in thirty-six localities and a total of 40,000 members.⁴¹ The majority of the delegates were young and inexperienced men, but some proved to have talent and energy. Palma was represented by a young bricklayer Francisco Tomàs. He published a small journal, *El Obrero*, which in its first number proclaimed the "complete destruction of political and juridical authorities" and had as its motto: "peace to men, war to institutions." Another interesting figure at the congress was Antonio Meneses, a student of engineering in Barcelona, who represented workers' societies in

Cadiz. He figured in the list of participants as a "dyer," just as some journalists were described as "printers," which helped to strengthen the appearance of the delegates as truly from the working class.

Eventually, the Spanish federation of the International was formed, with a federal council seated in Madrid. The Catalonians were responsible for publishing its main organ, *La Federación*, with Farga-Pellicer as editor-in-chief. The statutes of the federation put it squarely under the authority of the General Council in London. At the same time, the adoption of a resolution that condemned "political action" reflected the strength of Bakuninism.⁴²

In an appeal launched on 20 October 1871 the federal council urged the adherents of the International to found local federations, consisting of two or three trade sections, or even one section for several trades. To form such a section, "two or three individuals would be sufficient."⁴³ It would be difficult to establish exactly the number of sections and local federations or the number of members at any given time. According to Josep Termes, in September 1869 the organization in Barcelona numbered 4,426 members who paid dues, which is far below the number of 7,081 members given in Farga-Pellicer's report to the Basel congress. This number fell to 2,080 a year later and to 1,921 by the end of 1870, the main cause being epidemics of jaundice.⁴⁴ Nettlau said that "many of these sections were certainly very small and their efficiency and duration depended on the energy of a few founders and not on a large membership."⁴⁵ At the congress of the Spanish federation in Saragossa in April 1872, fifty-two local federations, with many still forming, were reported; these local federations had 353 sections. Yet only representatives of thirty localities attended the congress.

The political-ideological complexion of the Spanish organization was most complex, and different—though as yet uncrystallized—currents were brought together. Bakunin's partisans, organized in the secret *Alianza* and in control of the federation, were most zealous in spreading the teachings of their master. *La Federación* published his articles, translated from Swiss journals. The yearly congresses of the federation provided platforms for preaching, but also enabled intimate meetings and the recruitment of proselytes. And yet Bakunin's system had not achieved a monopoly. From the beginning, a great deal of ideological confusion existed in the Spanish International. In its first number, *La Federación* printed a declaration consonant with the resolution of the Workers' congress in Barcelona that a "democratic and federal Republic is the form of government which is most favourable to the interests of the working class, the political form necessary to achieve social emancipation."⁴⁶ This was quite a Marxist principle. In a subsequent number (24 October 1869), Marx was referred to as the "celebrated Socialist," the author of the *Manifesto* and the statutes of the International. Both texts were soon published in Spanish and two years later *The Civil War in France* appeared in Spanish from the same source. For a long time, no animosity existed toward Marx or the General Council in London. During 1871, *La Federación* published the long study written by Eccarius (marked here: "Un obrero"), and translated into Spanish under the title:

Refutación de las doctrinas económicas de John Stuart Mill. Probably, even the most active members of the Spanish federation, at that period of time, were unaware of the deep divisions between Marx and Bakunin, apart from the latter's few intimate friends. The ideas and slogans of the Russian master and of his circle began to penetrate deeply. Only five months after proclaiming support for a "democratic and federal republic," *La Federación* wrote the following: "La política es uno de estos errores funestos gastaría en vano los esfuerzos del proletariado en el siglo XIX."⁴⁷ If the Spanish workers wondered why their German brothers took part in parliamentary elections, *La Federación* explained that it was "solemento con objeto de propaganda y de agitación," a view very far removed from Bakunin's acid criticisms of the German Social Democrats.

Then, fresh influences came from Belgium. In its number of 7 November 1869, *La Federación* published a translation of an article that had appeared in the Brussels *L'Internationale*, propounding a conception of the International Association as a model for the organization of the society of the future, in which trade unions would hold the central positions and regulate all internal affairs while the General Council would be in charge of international relations. In May 1870, *La Federación* published a series of articles entitled "La representación del trabajo," advocating the creation of bases for an "economic workers' state" within the existing "political bourgeois state." A little later, in its number of 28 August 1870, the same newspaper discussed steps to be taken in order to turn the institution of the federal congress into a "representation of the Spanish nation," which would result in the concentration of all capital in the country in a national bank, until the progress of social revolution could produce a "universal international bank." These ideas evidenced some survival of the doctrines of Proudhon, though a "national" or a "universal" bank was anathema to Bakunin.

Amidst this ideological confusion doubts started to grow, in particular in Madrid. Members questioned the existence of the secret Alianza, and the idea of abstinence from politics was gradually losing adherents. The federal council, elected at the Barcelona Congress of 1870, endeavoured to establish permanent contact with the General Council in London. Two letters were written, one dated 30 July and the second 14 December 1870, but for a long time no answer was forthcoming. Eventually, Engels, who took over the function of the Spanish secretary, wrote a letter, which was dated 13 February 1871. To the Spaniards' complaint that the old political parties attracted popular support through their "empty declarations" and so blocked the progress of the International, Engels replied with the advice to form in Spain, as elsewhere, an independent political party with its own policies aimed at the emancipation of the working class. To abstain from political battles against the exploiting classes would be to abandon a powerful means of action. Engels advised the full use of the universal franchise.⁴⁸

The Paris Commune had a strong impact on events in Spain. The anger and fear of the possessing classes, stimulated by massive press propaganda, resulted in a wave of repression against the Spanish International. The federal council

decided to transfer its seat to Lisbon; should repression reach there, the council would move to London. Eventually three members of the federal council—Lorenzo, Francisco Mora, and Morago—went to the capital of Portugal. They lived there as "one family," supported by small grants from Madrid. They established contacts within Portugal and planned to expand into countries of Latin America.⁴⁹ Soon the Lisbon "trio" split over further tactical steps and personal differences. Mora and Lorenzo opposed Morago and looked to London for support.

A change of government in Spain created more favorable conditions for the International, and the federal council was reestablished in Madrid. Morago abdicated his seat and a new member, José Mesa, a printing worker, joined the council. His views were completely opposed to those of the Alianza. He strongly supported the idea, contained in the letter from Engels, of the organization of a workers' party. Mesa and his friends joined the Alianza, but they functioned in it like a Trojan horse.

In September 1871, a conference of the Spanish federation assembled in the city of Valencia. Members of the Alianza were in a majority; in fact, many of them met there for the first time. The confused ideological attitudes still prevailed, though the Alianza members believed that their principles had carried the day. The conference rejected any participation of the working class in the "governmental politics of the middle class," as such participation would only strengthen the existing order and paralyze the movement for revolutionary Socialism. Yet an effort was made to bring this view into harmony with the long since accepted commitment to "Republica democratica-federal." This was achieved by reference to the etymology of that concept: "Res publica, Democrazia."⁵⁰ The conference elected a new federal council, which included Lorenzo, Mora, and Mesa, but not Morago. The council had at its disposal an organ of its own, *Emancipación*.

The London conference provided an opportunity to clarify the position of the Spanish organization of the International. Lorenzo, as we know, came as the only Spanish delegate, and soon he came into contact with the two London masters, Marx and Engels. They endeavored to open Lorenzo's eyes to the true nature of Bakunin's alliance and its fraternal organization in Spain. These organizations, in the two masters' view, were created for the revolutionary elite endowed with the task of political and ideological guidance of the inferior and passive mass of members of the International. Writing his memoirs some thirty years later, Lorenzo confused various facts and data, yet he was able to describe vividly the atmosphere of the conference and his own disenchantment. He became convinced that the International had fallen into the hands of elements alien to the working class.⁵¹ On his return, Lorenzo communicated his impressions to his comrades in the federal council. Correspondence with London ceased for some time and Engels complained about it in a letter dated 25 November 1871, sent to the council in Madrid. By not reporting to London, he said, the Spanish group offended the statutes of the association.⁵²

Simultaneously, Engels sent a letter to Paul Lafargue, who with his wife had escaped from France to Spain and had settled in San Sebastian. Lafargue was instructed to form sections so that in the event the Spanish federation deserted to the Bakuninist camp, the General Council had points of support: "You are the only one on whom we could rely," Engels wrote in some desperation.⁵³ A fortnight later, on 9 December, Engels wrote again to Lafargue. The tone of that letter was more optimistic. Engels acknowledged the renewal of correspondence with the Spaniards. *La Federación*, noted Engels, had just published the text of resolutions passed at the London conference and a separate article on the most important resolution, No. 9, reprinted from *Emancipación*. The Spanish federation was in the throes of an internal conflict, Engels said, that must be resolved to our advantage.⁵⁴ In similar vein, Engels reported to the General Council.⁵⁵

The evolution in Spain provided opportunities for Lafargue's mission. Arriving in Madrid, he came in touch with the Internationalists, who made a strong impression. He wrote to Engels that he found them "very superior . . . I could say that I have never met a gathering of workers so intelligent and so well informed." Lafargue found also, to his chagrin, that Bakunin had widespread influence. Workers and bourgeois Republicans were under the false impression that it was Bakunin who had introduced Communism into the International under the name of "collectivism."⁵⁶

Lafargue gained influence and friends within the federal council. *Emancipación* became, to an extent, his tribune. Mesa and Mora were his allies. And yet his mission was far from being fulfilled. The Madrid council refused to follow in the steps of the Jura federation, but they sympathized with the view of the Belgian International, adopted at its last congress in December 1871, that the powers of the General Council must be strongly curtailed. The congress of the Spanish federation, to be held in April 1872, had to decide the federation's attitude on that issue. But already by March Engels was certain that, thanks to Lafargue, the battle in Spain was won. "So, the whole attempt of a rebellion ended in disgrace and we could proclaim victoire sur toute la ligne," he wrote to Laura Lafargue.⁵⁷

Bakunin was very apprehensive about the course that events were taking in Spain. He wrote to Lorenzo asking him for information about the accusations against him at the London conference, so that he could deal with the "Marxian cotérie." He appealed to his correspondent not to use the name of the alliance, because "the Alliance is a secret which none of us could make known without committing treason."⁵⁸ It is probable that Bakunin shared the conviction of his adversaries that the Spanish Alianza was part of the secret international organization of which he was the head.

The next congress of the Spanish federation took place in Saragossa between 4 and 11 April 1872. It was of major importance and brought about some significant changes.⁵⁹ One of the participants was Lafargue, who under the assumed name of "Pablo Farga" represented the section in Alcala de Henares. The main leaders present were Lorenzo, Mesa, F. Mora, Morago, and Tomàs. Sentiñón

and Farga-Pellicer were absent. The federal council in its report had no sympathy for the stand of the Jura federation, yet on the whole the report was conciliatory. The congress transferred the seat of its general council from Madrid to Valencia. Mora and Lorenzo were elected to the council, but Mora refused the mandate and Lorenzo, the new secretary general, resigned after two months and his place was taken by Tomàs.

Soon a split took place within the Madrid federation that was a renewal of a previous split. In July, Lafargue and his friends were removed for the second time from the federation. They formed their own New Madrid federation, but it failed to gain recognition from the federal council in Valencia. Engels came speedily to the rescue by granting to it the sanction of the General Council's subcommittee. Spanish members of the International made the accusation that the behavior of the General Council "se compara con el de los gobiernos burgueses premiando la delacion y la adulación."⁶⁰ The pro-London group proceeded to maneuver. *Emancipación*, which remained in their hands, published a declaration, signed by Mesa, Francisco Mora, and others, dissolving the Madrid branch of the Alianza, and they appealed to other localities to follow their example. So, the General Council received proof of the existence of the secret organization that it presumed to be a part of the secret international alliance, which had never been in fact dissolved. Engels demanded from the Spanish federal council that it provide him with a list of all the members of the alliance in Spain, with an indication of the offices held by the members in the organization of the IWMA and also of their ties abroad. Should the federal council fail to answer promptly, categorically, and in a satisfactory manner, they would be denounced in Spain and other countries for breaking the statutes of the International and for treachery committed in the interests of an alien and hostile society.⁶¹ The council in Valencia gave no immediate reply, but instead it imposed on its delegates to the forthcoming congress of the International an "imperative mandate," putting them under the obligation of fighting against the line taken by the General Council. The delegates chosen and mandated were Farga-Pellicer, Morago, Marselan, and Alerini.

Let us turn briefly to neighboring Portugal. The International took root there, but on a modest scale. A section was formed in Lisbon whose founding members were: Tedeschi, an elementary school teacher; Oretti, an excarpenter turned employee of a meteorological observatory; and Tito and França, both print workers. Mora, Morago, and Lorenzo entertained relations with them during their stay in Lisbon. In February 1872 the Lisbon section produced their own weekly paper, *O Pensamento Social*, which—a rather rare occurrence—received praise from Engels. The Lisbon members were cautious in their recruitment of workers, who usually had fantastic notions of the great wealth at the disposal of the International and its central authority. Nevertheless, resistance societies were organized under the shield of the International. In its letter to the General Council of 10 March 1872, the Lisbon organization declared its adherence to the IWMA. They claimed to possess 400 members and to be in affilia-

tion with three resistance societies whose membership was 950. Three months later, França reported 3,500 members, including various associations being affiliated to the IWMA.⁶² In the great conflict within the International, the Portuguese, unlike their Spanish neighbours, stood squarely on the side of the General Council. Lafargue, who visited Lisbon in August 1872, confirmed that this was their attitude. It was also Lafargue who carried their mandate to the congress that assembled a month later in The Hague.

The flourishing of the International in Italy and Spain was in sharp contrast with the situation in France. The mass slaughter in Paris, the triumph of Versailles, and the subsequent police repression on a vast scale resulted in the near annihilation of the organized forces of the International. Leaders and militants who had not fallen in Paris were under arrest or deported, and a large number found refuge abroad, mostly in Belgium, Switzerland, and England. Aubry, who, as we know, came from Rouen to Paris to participate in the Commune, was one of the few who decided to stay in France, regardless of the consequences. He was arrested but was released after a short time in prison. He drew some interesting conclusions from his experiences. In a letter of 4 August 1871 to Brismée in Brussels, written some ten days after his release, Aubry rejected the idea of the proletariat winning power with the help of "murderous weapons."⁶³ Malon, having become a refugee in Switzerland, reflected on the Commune and its lessons in a volume published there. His wrath was directed against the Blanquists, who, in his view, dominated the Commune. Not conspiracies and rebellions, he said, but the organization of the "gros bataillons" of the proletariat would secure the final victory.⁶⁴

In March 1872, the loi Dufaure imposed a legal ban on the International in France. Until that time, organizations in places distant from the capital enjoyed a measure of tolerance on the part of the authorities. The Geneva refugees and their Swiss associates succeeded in maintaining contact with some of these centers, which caused some disquiet in London. Serrailier, having returned to his post as the French secretary, tried to counteract their influence. According to Engels, he achieved excellent results. Old sections were revived, appearing under new names. In addition, he obtained proof that those who corresponded with the Bakuninists in Switzerland were spies of the French police. In one city of the south that role was apparently performed by the police chief himself.⁶⁵ The man referred to was Abel Bousquet, who was secretary of the section in Béziers. He did maintain contact with refugees in Geneva. According to the secretary of the heretic section of propaganda in Geneva, Bousquet performed the function of commissaire municipal in the course of 1871, at a time when the Council of Béziers was Republican and Socialist.⁶⁶ The whole story had marks of a witch-hunt. The partisans of the council in London were discovering more spies, usually among Bakunin's adherents.

Serrailier established a close association with a reconstituted illegal section in Paris, named Ferré, after one of the Commune's dead martyrs. The section was dominated by Blanquists. Serrailier corresponded with Émile Dentraygues,

a thirty-four-year-old railway clerk in Toulouse. At the meeting of the subcommittee on 19 July, Serrailier reported on activities in various departments and in a number of cities, including Bordeaux, Toulouse, and Paris.⁶⁷ Participants of The Hague congress were informed later about the existence of sections of the International in thirty out of eighty departments of France. All these rather optimistic reports were questioned by the opponents of the council in London.

Close to France, Belgium watched the events there with the greatest interest. The Paris Commune created a state of euphoria in the Internationalist community. This gave way to feelings of anger, *chagrin*, and, increasingly, to worship of the fallen heroes. In one case, this worship took the expression of Christian symbolism. The international proletariat was in Holy Communion with the Commune, we read in a paper of the Belgian organization. "Here is my body, said the Commune, here is the consecrated bread and we all followed its revindication of material nourishment, of life guaranteed by work. Here is my blood, it added."⁶⁸ The controversies within the International, which intensified after the fall of the Commune, were bound to include the Belgian organization and to clarify its positions. Hins saw in the Commune the fulfillment of antiauthoritarian Socialism.⁶⁹ Others preferred to take a neutral line between the two camps, but with the battle growing in intensity such neutrality became increasing difficult to maintain. A large number of refugees from Paris reached Brussels. They formed a section of their own under the guise of a mutual help society. Though they played a lesser role than their brethren in London or Geneva, they still exercised a certain influence. Their sympathies were mostly on the side of the opposition to London.⁷⁰

A congress of the Belgian federation assembled on 24 and 25 December 1871. Its participants faced the hard choice between the resolutions of the London conference and the circular of the Jura federation. The Belgian's resolution in this matter was masterfully worded. It was not directed overtly against the General Council, but against the "reactionary press," which called the International a despotic organization with an imposed hierarchy and discipline. The resolution declared, "once and for all," that the International was not and never had been anything else but an association of fully autonomous federations and the General Council was only a center for correspondence and advice. Nevertheless, a revision of the statutes of the International was postulated and the federal council in Brussels was authorized to propose new rules to the forthcoming congress.⁷¹ Though in its spirit and contents this resolution was very near the positions of the Jura federation, it avoided openly disavowing the General Council or the London conference. The Belgians refused the call for the immediate convocation of a congress. As a result, the Jurassians had to moderate their attitude and decided in favor of a "regular congress."⁷²

The situation in Belgium became a source of concern for Marx and Engels. They looked for and found, eventually, agents and informers in Belgium, though these were of dubious worth. One of them was Glaser de Willebrord. Marx and Engels met him during his journeys to London in 1871. He was a man of various

pursuits. Max Nettlau wrote about him: "a truly peculiar individual . . . A complete bourgeois, unofficial translator for legations . . . He was finally unmasked as a Russian spy."⁷³ De Willebrord undertook to work for the two Londoners inside the Brussels organization. However, he had to proceed most cautiously, because of the aura of mistrust that, as he admitted, surrounded him. In one of his letters, he tried to explain the inimical mood of the Belgians. Their representatives at the London conference complained that they were under pressure there and were unable to express their views freely.⁷⁴

In Spring 1872, the London masters gained another auxiliary. The restless Theodor Cuno, so active on their behalf in Italy, moved to Belgium. He settled in Verviers where he joined the "German section." Yet his possibilities of influencing the Belgians proved to be limited.

The struggle in the international arena had some grotesque moments. *L'Internationale*, the official organ of the Belgian federation, reprinted Utin's article that made vicious attacks on the Jura leaders.⁷⁵ When the Jura leaders protested, the editors of the Brussels paper expressed their regret that they had not read the article in question before its publication. The other paper, *Liberté*, a tribune of the remnants of Proudhonism, published a rather one-sided report on the Spanish congress in Saragossa, written by none other than Lafargue.⁷⁶

The extremist and the moderate wings of the Belgian federation fought out their battles at the congress that took place on 19 and 20 May 1872. Hins, the leader of the extremists, proposed a set of new rules for the International Association, to be submitted to the next general congress. He envisaged the total abolition of the General Council. After some controversy, it was resolved to submit this proposal for discussion and, on that basis, to reach a decision at an extraordinary congress to be held during the summer. The moderates were successful at the congress—eight delegates voted for Hins's proposal, ten voted against. Nevertheless, the congress voted to curtail the powers of the General Council. The German section from Verviers was removed from the federation, but this did not exclude it automatically from the International Association.

The Northern Bastions

While the turn of events in Switzerland, Italy, Spain, France, and Belgium was not very favorable to the London leadership, the situation was by no means clear and happy in other countries where so far the "loyalists" had prevailed. The German labor movement was engrossed more than ever in internal events and problems. The patriotic euphoria, which had engulfed great masses of people during the war with France, was intensified by the final act of unification and the creation of the Second Reich. Only the most politically advanced workers shared the stand taken by Bebel and Liebknecht. They had to face the enmity or the incomprehension of their fellows, and they became the target of the increasingly repressive measures of the authorities. In November 1870, members of the executive of the Social Democratic party in Braunschweig were arrested. Soon, Bebel and Liebknecht were imprisoned in Leipzig, but they were freed after the election to the Reichstag, the parliament of united Germany, which took place on 3 March 1871. The election brought a setback to both the Eisenachers and Lassalleans. Only Bebel secured a seat in the Reichstag. A new wave of repression came in the wake of events in Paris, and it intensified after the fall of the Commune. When the congress of the Social Democrats assembled in the city of Dresden in August 1871, its members were prevented from discussing the events of the Commune by the supervising police commissar. The congress succeeded in passing a resolution in which solidarity with the defeated Communards was veiled as an "agreement with the attitude taken by the Party organ *Volkstaat* towards the political and social problems of the last year."

Marx presented the Social Democratic party as the true branch of the International in Germany and the lack of more formal ties was explained, at the London

conference, by the rigors of the legislation in force in Germany. As we know, he approved of the stand taken by the party's leaders in the Reichstag during the Franco-German war and especially their opposition to the annexation of Alsace and Lorraine. He used their behavior and tactics as an example and an argument in his fight against the abstentionists and antiparlamentarians. Yet, Marx, and also Engels, were hiding from the General Council and the London conference their dissatisfaction with the reservations toward the German leaders, despite their heroic stand. They were constantly impressing on the party heads in Germany their "duty" to follow the guidance and advice coming from London; they also constantly interfered in the editorial policies of the party organ. They eventually established direct contact with Berlin and made clear their intentions to approach other sections in Germany directly. Liebknecht could not restrain his anger at Marx's interventions. He accused Marx of rendering "very bad service" to the cause, but this led only to another outburst of anger from London.

Yet, Marx and Engels began to soften their tactics, just as the opposition in various countries was raising its head. One aim was now paramount in the minds of the Londoners, that of securing a majority at the coming congress. In May, Engels urged Liebknecht to get the German party to declare itself explicitly as the German federation of the International and to pay dues before the beginning of the congress. Otherwise, Engels threatened, the party would be declared a foreign and indifferent body.² In a letter sent a few days earlier to Cuno, Engels complained that the Germans had subordinated the International to their own "specific German purposes."³ These letters were written after Bebel and Liebknecht were tried in court for high treason. In the trial, lasting from 11 to 27 March 1872, they were accused, among other things, of participation in the IWMA. Liebknecht bravely defended the International and praised the "scientific spirit" of Karl Marx. Both were found guilty and sentenced to two years' imprisonment; the third person accused, a young coeditor of *Volksstaat* Adolf Hepner, was freed. When the congress of the International assembled six months later in The Hague, Bebel and Liebknecht were imprisoned in the fortress of Hubertsburg; Hepner appeared in The Hague as one of the German team of delegates.

The Hapsburg empire, "Austria-Hungary" in 1867, was a relatively new territory into which the Workers' International intruded. The capital Vienna and the German-speaking parts of the empire were drawn within the vortex of movements and ideas current in Prussia and other parts of Germany. Nor were Bohemia, Hungary, and Galicia immune to those influences.⁴ In the late 1860s, individuals and small groups were in touch with Becker's organization in Geneva and also with the Eisenachers in Germany. The constitutional reforms of 1867 favored the growth of trade and educational societies. Journals sympathetic to the ideas of Socialism began to appear. There was no national center to direct this spontaneous growth, and so the new bodies looked abroad for help and advice. When a bricklayers' and stonemasons' association wrote to

Liebknecht asking for advice on organizational matters, he directed them to Hess in Paris to establish a liaison with their fellow-tradesmen there.⁵ Closer links were achieved by two leading Internationalists living in Paris, Léo Frankel and Henry Bachruch, both belonging to the German section in that city.

Gradually, leaders appeared and the movements, first in Germanic Austria and then in the other lands of the empire, began to integrate. One of the pioneers was Heinrich Oberwinder. He took part in the Eisenach congress of 1869 and, then, in the Basel congress of the International at which he represented the "Vienna section." The other Austrian representative in Basel was Ludwig Neumayer, who carried mandates from a section in Wiener-Neustadt and a "section in Bohemia." Both were fairly young men, twenty-five and twenty-nine years old, who were university graduates in law and practiced journalism. Yet within the budding movement they represented two different tendencies. Oberwinder favored agreements with the Liberal bourgeoisie, and on the question of rights for non-German nationalities he favored a rather nationalistic tendency, while Neumayer was a radical and internationalist.

The government decided to destroy the movement before it grew to any strength. Neumayer was arrested in 1870, but at the trial the jury found him not guilty and he was released. Oberwinder and one of his collaborators, Andreas Scheu, were arrested, tried, and sentenced to six and five years respectively, but an amnesty secured their release after a few months, in February 1871.

Becker's *Vorbote* was also read in various places in the non-German lands of the monarchy. Yet the growth of the movement in those areas was stimulated mainly by political developments and the progress of industrialization. A General Workers Association was founded in 1868 in Pest and it became the recruitment ground for the International. A young metal worker, Károly Farkas, was active in that cause in the city of Temesvár and later in the capital of Hungary. During the witchhunt that followed the defeat of the Paris Commune, Farkas and twenty-eight of his comrades were arrested. According to the prosecutor, only thirteen of them were formally members of the IWMA. The trial ended with acquittal by the jury for all except one of the accused, who had died in prison. The jury system proved to be a brake on persecutions by the police and the judicial authorities.

In Bohemia and Moravia, those most affected by the influence of the International were German-speaking workers who could read the *Vorbote* and other papers reaching them from Saxony and Vienna. Despite the rapid growth of trade societies and cooperatives at a period when industrial progress in Bohemia surpassed such progress in all the other lands of the monarchy, Czech-speaking workers were either ignorant of or wary of the International. A serious factor in this estrangement was the nationalistic attitudes prevailing among German and Austrian partisans of Socialism. Also the rejection of Czech national claims by the German left in the revolution of 1848 was not forgotten. When Czech Socialism became a mass movement, the First International had no longer existed.

According to a Czech historian, the only Czech-speaking section of the International existed from 1870 in New York, and it was very active at the time of the Franco-German war.⁶

Two other countries, bordering on Germany, Denmark and Holland, came at a late stage within the orbit of the International. A growing number of young men in both countries were sympathetic to the workers' cause and were attracted by the ideas of Socialism. The magnetic pull of the International, whose fame was growing, was bound to result in tangible achievements. The drama of the Paris Commune mobilized sensitive hearts and minds and brought scores of converts.

A group in Copenhagen, which entertained relations with German Social Democrats and with Becker in Geneva, formed a section in September 1871. The main founder and leader of that section was Louis Pio, a thirty-year-old exofficer and expost official, whose deep Christian faith convinced him of the truth and necessity of Socialism. A journal edited by Pio and Brix began to appear under the title *Socialisten*. One of Pio's collaborators was the carpenter Theodor Sophus Phil, a man with experience in foreign countries and with a knowledge of several languages.⁷ The Copenhagen section tried to establish contact with the General Council. Toward the end of 1871, Pio wrote a letter to London. Mottershead, who was the actual and rather nominal secretary for Denmark, neglected the letter and the answer was eventually written by Engels. Its main topic was the great conflict with and the machinations of Bakunin's faction.⁸ By May 1872, the Danish authorities had repressed the young movement. They refused to allow an open-air meeting in Copenhagen, and this led to the arrest of Pio and his two comrades. Phil escaped imprisonment, and he represented the Danes at The Hague Congress. He was numbered there among the pro-Marxian majority.

Holland, though close to Belgium and also to the great industrial center of the Ruhr, languished behind these and other areas in its acceptance of the International.⁹ Some sections were founded in the years 1869-1870, but they had an ephemeral existence. Hendrik Gerhard, who founded in Amsterdam a tailors' society, was active in favor of the International and helped to found a multitrade section of the organization in that city. At the beginning of 1871 a section was also formed in The Hague through the initiative of a German printer living there, Bruno Liebers. A small section emerged in Utrecht. The young sections had to contend with the enmity of the employers and also with indifference and even opposition on the part of many workers, often influenced by the clergy or by bourgeois Liberals. The Amsterdam section took over the duties of a Dutch federal council. According to Gerhard, in his letter to Marx of 21 July 1872, the International had 250 members in Holland, but their influence extended over trade societies with 3,000 members. Unlike in other countries, the authorities did not persecute the International's members, and public opinion was not unsympathetic to the organization. The major difficulty was of a material nature: "le maudit argent."¹⁰

Let us turn our attention to the United States, which came only late within the orbit of the International. There were many links and contacts between the General Council and the various leaders, groups, and press organs in the United States, but years passed and no organization of the International came into existence there. At one stage, ties were established with the National Labour Union in the United States, and its delegate, Cameron, participated in the congress of Basel. He also visited London. The report that he gave on his return did not encourage workers to join the IWMA. Cameron stressed the differences between the North American continent and Europe, whose institutions and state of society were "a legitimate offspring, the inevitable offshoot of despotism." While revolution was the order of the day in Europe, the Americans required only "a just administration of fundamental principles upon which government is founded." Nevertheless, the union's convention of 1870 passed a resolution declaring the union's "adherence to the principles of the International Workingmen's Association." They also expressed their expectation of joining the International in "a short time."¹¹

Shortly after the Basel congress, a section of the International, calling itself Section No. 1, was founded in New York. This section, with some fifty members at its foundation, also was known as Local No. 5 to the National Labour Union, and so it became a link between the two great organizations. Its main leader was Friedrich Adolph Sorge, a music teacher. He came to the United States from Germany after the defeat of the 1848 revolution and became active in radical circles of New York. Section No. 1 was composed almost exclusively of German immigrants. Sorge was joined by Siegfried Meyer and August Vogt, who had been early enthusiasts of the International in Germany. Sorge and the two new arrivals fought over personal differences. Meyer complained in a letter to Eccarius that Sorge had removed him from his post of corresponding secretary in Local No. 5. He would rather work among the Anglo-Americans, he said, whose leaders had cleaner hands, than among the Germans.¹² Sorge found a new collaborator in the person of Friedrich Bolte, a cigarmaker.

In the Spring of 1870, two French societies coalesced into Section No. 2 of the American International. The main leader of that section was Gustave Paul Cluseret. He won the rank of general in the American Civil War, on the side of the North. Cluseret was an adventurous man with a shady past. In March 1870, he received authority from London to act as "correspondent" for the United States. It was not a fortunate step, as Parisian workers had not forgotten that he had played a part in the suppression of the June 1848 uprising. Many who had contact with him complained about his bullying disposition and behavior. When he left for France in August 1870, there was a sigh of relief in New York.

The two sections, the German and the French, collaborated closely. Each of the sections probably numbered less than one hundred members, but they represented a wide variety of political and ideological currents. The Germans divided into Lassalleans and anti-Lassalleans, of whom Sorge was one. The organ of the

German section, *Die Arbeiter-Union*, published some extracts from Marx's *Das Kapital*, but also chapters from Edward Kellog's *New Monetary System*, which preached the emancipation of labor through monetary reform. There were Proudhonists among the French, but also Cabetists ("Icarians") and Fourierists.¹³

Soon another section was founded. Its members were mainly Czechs, but a number were German-speaking immigrants from Bohemia and Moravia.¹⁴ The three sections, the German, French, and Czech, united in December 1870 and formed the central committee of the IWMA in North America. Sorge was elected general secretary. Marx disliked the pretentious title and also the fact that there were hardly any native Americans within the orbit of the new association. Marx drew the following analogy at the General Council's meeting: if the council in London represented only the German, the Swiss, and the French clubs in the British capital, it would not be able to call itself the central committee for England, Ireland, and Scotland. Eventually, the General Council gave its sanction to the central committee in New York after it had embraced four other German sections, two each in New York and Chicago, and an Irish section founded in New York.¹⁵ The total number of members was, according to Sorge, 293.¹⁶

As elsewhere, events of the Franco-German war and the Paris Commune had a great impact on the American sections. The American sections, on the whole, supported the stand taken by the General Council, as expressed in the successive manifestos, though some Germans succumbed to the nationalist euphoria and stood in opposition to the majority. The Irish section popularized the International's stand on the Irish question and so was gaining members and sympathizers. However, most members of this section were Fenians rather than partisans of international Socialism. A Fenian leader, O'Donovan Rossa, freed from British imprisonment, arrived in New York in 1870. He was warmly greeted by members of the International. He soon entered the ranks of the enemies of the Paris Commune and of the International. In his report to the London conference, Sorge blamed the persistence of religious and political prejudices for the lack of success among the Irish; their leaders were "knaves or tools of knaves." Other immigrant communities, complained Sorge, were difficult to reach, too. They were all seized by the delusion, turned into a faith, that America, unlike the countries of their origin in Europe, was a land of immense wealth, accessible to all.¹⁷

Despite Sorge's pessimism, and a degree of misanthropy, the International in America was making progress. The Paris Commune was a trauma to all classes of the population and all shades of public opinion.¹⁸ Growing numbers of native Americans and the new émigrés from Europe, in particular from France, joined sections of the International and also formed new ones. To the sections in New York and Chicago were added sections in Boston, Philadelphia, Washington, St. Louis, New Orleans, and San Francisco. There were ten sections under the authority of the central committee in New York in May 1871 and thirty-five at the end of that year. The section in Philadelphia had fifty-four members, mostly

tradesmen, but also six medical doctors, a dentist, a lawyer, two students of law, a civil engineer, a teacher, two businessmen, and an industrialist. Section No. 23 in Washington, according to its report sent to the General Council and read by the council at the meeting of 25 July 1871, contained mostly journalists, but that proved to be beneficial to the cause of the International. That section chose to correspond directly with London after the New York committee demanded lists of members and their addresses. Marx thought that the committee's demand was excessive. In the end, the Washington section submitted to the central committee.

Two sisters in New York, Victoria Woodhall and Tennessee Claflin, founded a section of their own in New York. The two women were involved in a banking and brokerage business and had ties with the financial plutocracy, yet their main passion was for an all-embracing reform of humanity. They fought for women's equality, which they partly understood as the right to "free love." They advocated land and monetary reforms, general disarmament, and a universal language, but gradually they embraced other causes, spiritualism among them. In May 1870, the two sisters began publishing the *Woodhall and Claflin's Weekly*. The paper gave attention and sympathy to the IWMA. In the great conflict in France, the *Weekly* took the side of the Communards. The sisters contributed funds to the publication of *The Civil War in France*. At the end of 1871, they published in their paper the *Manifesto of the German Communist Party*, which was a shortened version of the old work by Marx and Engels, whose names, however, were omitted.

In July 1871, the two sisters founded Section No. 12. It embraced various individuals of a bourgeois or intellectual background. The section launched an appeal to "English-speaking Americans" which postulated political equality and social freedom for both sexes, the establishment of a universal government, and the abolition of language differences.¹⁹ Soon a conflict developed between the Central Committee and Section No. 12. The sisters and their friends claimed it was their mission to work among Americans for the cause of the International, as Sorge with his German and French associates (soon called a "sect of ignorant aliens") were incapable of it. Members of Section No. 12 revolted against the preponderance of one particular section, the German Section No. 1, which threatened to impose its tyranny over other sections. To Sorge and his partisans, Section No. 12 was a parasitic growth on the body of the International and a receptacle for bourgeois fantasies.

The conflict in America came to the forum of the General Council in London. Section No. 12 found its defenders in Eccarius, the American secretary, and Hales, the general secretary. The O'Brienites, who shared some ideas with that section, also took its side. Marx and Engels, reluctant at first to engage in the quarrel, sided eventually with Sorge and the central committee. The conflict sharpened when the Committee adopted the rule that at least two-thirds of members of sections of the International must be wage earners. If strictly applied, this rule would have disallowed the whole American organization. Section No. 12

was joined now by other sections and a wide front of opposition emerged. The central committee, changing its name to the federal council, in agreement with the new rule of the London Conference, was faced now with a rival body that also adopted the title of Federal Council.

In March 1872, the General Council passed a resolution condemning Section No. 12 and suspending its membership in the International until the next congress considered the matter. The rule about membership composition was confirmed. At the same time, the resolution appealed to the two American councils to unite and call a congress of American sections that would elect a new authority.²⁰ This complex and probably contradictory resolution led to demands for clarification, and the General Council had to declare that it gave recognition only to the federal council under Sorge's command. It was inevitable that the Woodhall-Claflin faction became the ally of the Jurassians. Engels denounced the American dissenters as "state exploiters, careerists, free lovers, ghost-hunters and other bourgeois swindlers."²¹ That Eccarius became involved with these people, Engels commented uncharitably, was due to the fact that he "envisaged in the *Woodhall and Claflin's Weekly* a new literary shelter."²²

Analysis of events on the international scene, after the London Conference, shows sharp reversals for the General Council and its Marxian nucleus. The Jura federation became the focus of all the dissatisfied groups and currents. The rebellious elements threatened to gather into a formidable force. But also within the London Council moods of rebellion against the predominant masters were gaining in intensity.

The last official list of members, figuring in the report of the General Council's meeting on 16 April 1872, contained as many as fifty names.²³ Some of these names were or became fictitious. The true number of members of the council, including those who participated irregularly, was probably thirty-nine. Of the thirty-nine, fifteen were British, including the Irishman MacDonnell, thirteen were French, seven were German, two were Polish, one was Swiss, and one was Hungarian. The British members consisted of two groups: the O'Brienites and the men who represented the newly formed British federation. The journalist Maltman Barry belonged to that group of recently coopted members, but he quarrelled with Hales, and Hales's friends attempted to cancel his mandate. Barry found support in the O'Brienites and also in Karl Marx. It seemed good tactics to Marx to have Barry on his side as a counterweight to the growing ambitions of Hales. Marx was concerned that the British federation would slip from the control of the General Council. He was not disturbed that Barry worked for the Conservative *Daily Standard* and showed a capacity for intrigue.

The French contingent in the General Council decreased after the London conference, but then increased again, despite the resolution of the conference on that matter. In Spring 1872, Dupont returned from Manchester to London and took his place in the council, though the post of French secretary was still held by Serrailier. Cooptions increased the strength of the Blanquists around

Vaillant. They, too, became Marx's allies. They supported him in the great conflict with the anarchists and in the lesser conflict with the British federation. Marx had some of his staunchest partisans among the French. These were: Serrailier, Johannard, Longuet, Dupont, and a new enigmatic figure, Le Moussu. The core of Marx's party was still the Germans, whose long-standing participation and experience in the council gave them an exceptional standing. Engels's intellectual capacity and vitality made up for his joining the council late. Both Jung and Frankel were absorbed into the circle and increased its strength. Frankel's admiration and reverence for Marx was most intense. In his letters Frankel addressed Marx as "Mon cher maître" and constantly sought his advice and approval.²⁴ His versatility and his many contacts among the French, Germans, and others were great assets to the Marxian party. By including the Irishman MacDonnell, Barry, and the two Poles in the council, we find that the party around Marx, both in number and quality, was still preponderant. The subcommittee, the true executive of the council, continued meeting on a regular basis and grew in importance. It usually met in Engels's house, which was conveniently situated in the Regent's Park area.

Despite its appearance of great strength, the General Council was seething under the surface with animosities in which ideological differences, political rivalries, group interests, and private ambitions all played their part. The French member, Courmet, shouted in some disgust at the council's meeting of 23 June: "at every meeting two or three hours are lost in personal quarrels."²⁵

Even insignificant matters were discussed with great heat and venom. Eccarius became the object of a controversy with strong personal undertones. As noted before, he was criticized because of his activities as secretary general and press correspondent. Renewed attacks followed his reports on the London conference, published in *The Times* and other organs, though these were written in the most advantageous tone and should have been applauded by any friend of the cause.

The old rivalry between Eccarius and Hales revived with the founding of the British federation. Eccarius questioned Hales's simultaneous holding of the post of general secretary in the General Council and a similar post in the federal council. Under joint pressure from Eccarius, the O'Brienites, Mottershead, and Barry, Hales resigned his post in the federation, though it did not diminish his role and influence there.

In summer 1872 Eccarius came into conflict with Marx and Engels over the American issues. Eccarius did not observe the line dictated by the two masters. Marx began to intervene directly in American affairs. In addition, the French sections in the United States were transferred from Eccarius to Le Moussu. Though Eccarius had on his side the O'Brienites and a few others, he declared his intention to resign his post of American secretary. He wrote a letter to Marx that was full of bitterness. He demanded to be shown a copy of the "indictment" against himself before the next council's meeting. The letter ended: "Hoping you will pardon my intrusion, I remain, Sir, J. George Eccarius."²⁶ In the end,

Eccarius resigned his post and Le Moussu took over responsibility for the whole movement in America. The most ferocious participant in the debate on that matter was Engels, which led Mottershead to observe that he had never heard a speech more virulent than that of Citizen Engels.

The suggestion by Hales's friends to coopt Doctor Sexton, who belonged to the Manchester branch of the British federation, was also hotly debated. At the council's meeting of 23 April, Serrailier opposed the candidature, arguing that Sexton engaged in immoral practices connected with some "anatomic museum" of doubtful reputation. Barry supported Serrailier, while Hales defended Sexton as a partisan and friend of Robert Owen. When it came to a vote the next week, Sexton was coopted by eleven to eight votes. A large number of those present, mostly Blanquists, abstained.²⁷ Sexton appeared only once at a meeting of the General Council, the last one before the congress in The Hague. He was, nevertheless, elected at that meeting as one of the General Council's delegates to that congress.

It was inevitable that the Marxian group, the leading group in the General Council, would clash with the expanding and increasingly ambitious faction led by Hales. The issue that became the bone of contention was the Irish question, emerging once again at the forum of the Council. MacDonnell, supported by Marx, proceeded to organize sections in Ireland and also to take Irish workers in Britain under his wings. The prospect of a separate Irish federation must have been disquieting to the leaders of the British federation. At the General Council's meeting, Hales proposed a resolution that the formation of "nationalist Irish branches" was contrary to the rules and principles of the International. Irish branches were founded in Liverpool and Middlesbrough, and they refused to join the British federation. They defined themselves as "Republican" and proclaimed the freedom of Ireland from foreign yokes. Hales, having forgotten the old debates and resolutions on Ireland, declared that the International had nothing to do with the cause of that country's liberation or with the institution of any particular form of government, whether in England or in Ireland.

MacDonnell was supported by the Marx party and the O'Brienites, whose pro-Irish sympathies were of old standing. Mottershead, Hales's old rival, joined in. Hales, he thought, expressed the domineering spirit animating uneducated Englishmen against their Irish brethren. Engels entered the battle with a powerful attack on Hales. He drew some analogies: would it be right for the General Council to subject a Polish section to a council in Petersburg, or sections in Northern Schleswig or in Alsace to a council in Berlin? If Hales prevailed, Irish workers would have to be told that after periods of aristocratic and bourgeois rule of their country they ought to expect domination by the English working class. Hales, in defense, declared that he too favored the independence of Ireland because only then would the Irish people wake up from their state of enchantment and find that nationalism was not a cure for the ills of society. The Irish members were Fenians rather than Internationalists. When it came to a

vote, Hales found himself abandoned even by his close friends; May, who supported him in the debate, abstained from voting.²⁸

One of the most dramatic meetings of the General Council took place on 11 June 1872.²⁹ Twenty-six members were present. Jung read a letter he had received from the Jura federation. It contained details about sections and their membership. They also sent a subscription for the years 1871 and 1872. The Jurassians proved to be in that respect more scrupulous than the other organisations in the various countries. Engels opposed the acceptance of the contribution for the year 1872. Had a majority supported him, it would have amounted to the exclusion of the Jura federation from the IWMA and from participation in the coming congress. Marx disagreed, arguing that they had not been excluded so far. Serrailier proposed a way out: he would "accept the money and reject the men." Marx insisted that the contributions be accepted and the membership of the Jura federation recognized with one exception, that of the section for propaganda and revolutionary action in Geneva. His proposal was accepted.

At the meeting Hales and Eccarius expressed the view that each nationality be represented in the council by one member only. Arnaud, a member of the large French contingent, opposed on the grounds that too much attention was being given to members' nationality. Perhaps, in one country there was lack of revolutionary fire and too much of it in another country. The International served humanity as a whole. Hales disagreed. If the nationality were ignored, a country might be represented by a person ignorant of its nationality. It was a clear allusion to the offices held by Marx, Engels, and others. Various nations, continued Hales, have their own modes of expression and the General Council should present a harmonious entity. This discussion brought, in the end, no tangible results.³⁰

Preparations were made, in the meantime, for the first congress of the British Federation, to be held in the second half of July in Nottingham. During the eight months of the federations activity, twenty branches of the federation were founded in England and Scotland, mostly in large towns: Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham, Nottingham, Leeds, Glasgow, and, of course, in the capital. The O'Brienites entered the federation in force. Some of the federation leaders were friends of Marx. The German Ruehl, a member of the General Council, was also a member of the federal council. The Manchester section was led, for a time, by Dupont and he was assisted by Edward Jones, a friend of Engels. The International Labour Protection League in Nottingham joined the International and then appointed Serrailier its representative in the federal council.

The federal congress had to assemble on 21 July. Five days earlier, Hales came to the meeting of the General Council. He was armed with a letter of the British council demanding information on the Irish branches in Great Britain: when were they approved by the General Council, what language was used at their meetings, and so on. Emotions flared and angry words were exchanged. Eventually, it was agreed to pass the matter to the subcommittee.³¹ When the

subcommittee assembled three days later, it was not to formulate answers to the posed questions, but, on Marx's initiative, to investigate Hales's activities, which were directed against the General Council and hurt the interests of the International. It appears, from a not too clear report of that meeting, that Marx had received some information about Hales's designs to give powers to particular federal councils in order to change the membership of the General Council. Marx demanded that Hales be removed from his post of general secretary, but Wróblewski tried to soften the proposal by changing the word *remove* to *suspend*. This was accepted and the final say was left to the General Council. It is interesting to note that Jung and Frankel were skeptical about Marx's sources of information as to Hales's intentions.³²

At the congress Hales proposed a resolution that differed from the version obtained by Marx but aimed, nevertheless, at limiting the powers of the General Council.³³ Hales postulated that the federal council in London be given the authority to *communicate directly with other federal councils*. The proposal seemingly contravened the rules of the International. Hales was supported by Doctor G. B. Clark, a member of the federal council. He referred to the recent strike of agricultural workers in Warwickshire, during which the General Council appealed to workers in Ireland to prevent the importing of strikebreakers from that country. This was fine, but what if the General Council were transferred to America, Clark asked. It would be absurd for countries divided by a sea channel to correspond via the ocean. Despite Dupont's protests, the proposal was passed by a majority. The congress passed another motion made by Hales. It was an appeal to form a "distinct labor party," based on the principles of the International. This was in full accordance with the well-known resolution of the London conference, but an initiative to form a party in Great Britain, escaping the patronage and control of the General Council, was unacceptable to Marx and Engels. The congress of Nottingham marked the deepening of the conflict between the two centers of authority in London, the old international and the new national one.

On 23 July, two days after the Nottingham congress came to a close, the General Council met. Hales and his friends were absent. Only two British members were present, Barry and Milner, both hostile to Hales. Of the nineteen members present, a clear majority were Marx's friends. On the recommendation of the subcommittee, Hales was suspended from his duty as secretary general until the "judicial committee" made its report. Milner was elected when nine members voted for him against five for Eccarius, to "assist the Secretary for the time being," which meant election to the post of provisional general secretary.³⁴ A week later, Hales appeared at the meeting of the General Council and had to face a concerted attack. Dupont accused Hales of "treason against the General Council" at the Congress in Nottingham. Hales was asked to return to the council all the books and correspondence relating to his office of secretary general. He eventually gave them to Marx. It was by no means the end of recriminations. At one of the meetings, at which Hales was absent, Boon brought to light that

Hales was receiving 15 shillings a week for his services, while he had offered to work for 5 shillings when the office was held by Eccarius, increased later to 10 shillings when Hales became the secretary general.³⁵

The last weeks before the convening of the general congress in The Hague were full of dissensions, disarray, recriminations, and changing of sides within the General Council. When Engels presented to its meeting on 6 August his report on the alliance, already accepted by the subcommittee, it met with the disfavor of the Blanquists, and they were supported by the two English rivals, Hales and Barry. Hales doubted the veracity of the report and saw the whole conflict as the intrigue of one secret society against another. Johannard, until now faithful to Marx, asked that the report be supplemented by documentary evidence. Despite all these criticisms, the report was recommended to be submitted to the congress by a majority.³⁶

By now, another defection from the Marx party was in the making. Jung began opposing Marx and Marx's friends on some issues. In the question of the alliance, if we believe Jung's later account, he favored dealing with opponents through political discussion and not by means of character assassination and tough military-like measures.³⁷ Marx and Engels had to contend now, not only with the growth of opposition and the spreading of rebellion on an international scale but also with adversaries in their main fortress. They could no longer count on some allies, nor even on close friends.

The tensions within the council reached their peak at its last meeting before the congress.³⁸ Jung proposed to transfer the seat of the General Council to Belgium or Switzerland. After a heated discussion it came to a vote: twelve members voted for the proposal and fourteen against; one member abstained. The result was very close. The majority in this important vote consisted of eight Frenchmen, four Germans, Frankel, and Townshend, who was the only English member. In favor of Jung's motion were seven British members, three Frenchmen—Dupont, Johannard, and Serrailier—and Eccarius and Jung. So, in opposition to Marx and Engels there were, at that moment, not less than five of Marx's partisans, whose loyalty and commitment in the past had been total and wholehearted. The British members who voted for Jung's motion clearly desired to free the growing movement in Britain from the tutelage of the General Council, which the British found increasingly oppressive. The Blanquists, who were in favor of the council remaining in London, feared loss of influence with its transfer to another place; there was a clear chance that, in time, they would become the preponderant element, if the council stayed in London. Marx and Engels were losing their sense of security.

The Fulfillment

The decision as to the time and place of the fifth congress of the International, for which all clamoured, was considered by the General Council at its meeting of 11 June 1872. The congress was to begin on the first Monday in September. The young Dutch organization was appointed as the host of the congress, and it had to decide the choice of locality. Within a short time, The Hague, one of the two capitals of the Netherlands, was chosen. It is not difficult to explain that decision. The Hague was as close as possible to London, easily accessible to Germans and also fairly distant from the main centers of opposition to the General Council. Becker had proposed Geneva, where, he thought, the loyalists would carefully watch over the membership and proceedings of the congress, but this location was rejected by London. True, The Hague would enable the Belgians to participate in some force, but their opposition was considered to be moderate. In The Hague itself the main influence was that of Liebers, a partisan of Marx. It was Liebers who managed the organization and administration of the congress.¹

Marx and Engels prepared for the coming battle at the congress with great care, but they were not certain of its results. Marx considered various possibilities. He warned some of his correspondents of his intention to withdraw completely from any functions in the International.² To Nikolai Danielson, his correspondent in St. Petersburg, Marx wrote in his curious linguistic mixture and used cryptograms: "Ich bin so overworked, and in fact so much interfered with my theoretical studies, that, after September, I shall withdraw from the commercial concern which, at this moment, weighs principally upon my shoulders, and which, as you know, has its ramifications all over the world."³ It is

difficult to judge whether Marx was sincere, or whether his declarations were part of a larger design. At least one of his correspondents, Glaser de Willebrord, expressed his full understanding of a step that would free his "cher et honoré maître" from perfidious lies and accusations.⁴

In the psychological war that Marx and Engels launched against their adversaries, they boasted about the strength of their own camp, but as the time of the congress approached they intensified their exhortations to followers to mobilize all their resources in order to avoid the most real threat of defeat. In an alarming letter to Sorge, Marx wrote: "At this Congress the life and death of the International is at stake. You and, at least, one more, if not two, must come." He also instructed Sorge to send not fewer than twelve mandates to London.⁵ Engels was assuring Hepner in Leipzig that the German language would enjoy equality with French and English at the congress and that ignorance of these languages should not prevent anybody from coming. He also asked for a mandate to be sent to Cuno, living in Belgium; "that was of the utmost importance."⁶

Suddenly, an event in Italy came as a godsend; the Rimini congress, dominated by Bakuninists elements, refused to participate in the general congress. This refusal was meant as a demonstration against the General Council, but it weighed substantially in favor of Marx in the balance of forces gathered to fight the great battle. There was another gift from heaven. Danielson in St. Petersburg arranged the dispatch of a letter that one of his friends, Nikolai Lyubavin, had received in March 1870 from Nechaev. Some time earlier, Bakunin had obtained from Lyubavin, a Russian scientist involved in revolutionary circles, an advance of 300 rubles toward the fee for his agreed translation of *Das Kapital* into Russian. In the name of a fictitious organization and in menacing words, Nechaev demanded that Bakunin be freed from this undertaking and that Lyubavin forgo the advance payment. In Marx's hands, the letter was bound to be used as damning evidence, even though Lyubavin expressed disbelief that Bakunin knew anything about it; he was guilty only of bad faith in refusing to fulfill the contract. Otherwise, Lyubavin, who considered Bakunin and his activities harmful, concurred in Marx's efforts to discredit him.⁷

The congress assembled on Monday, 2 September.⁸ It is not easy to establish the number of delegates. Sorge in his report gives the number of sixty-five; Guillaume—sixty-seven, but he included the Russian Zhukovski and the American West, both excluded from the congress. Engels gave in his article for *La Plebe* the number sixty-four, which seems to be correct.⁹ From London came a team of twenty-three men, which was without precedent. Some London delegates carried mandates from faraway countries. For example, Engels had one mandate from Breslau and another from New York. Barry represented Section No. 3 in Chicago, and Vaillant a section in La Chaux-de-Fonds, which was opposed to the Jura federation.

It was the first time that Marx and Engels had appeared at a congress of the International. Marx, who came with his family, became the object of great interest not only inside the Congress but also outside, among journalists and the

general public. Most of the delegates met the two leaders for the first time. They towered in prestige, authority, and knowledge of facts and data. They were unsurpassed in debating skills. Their self-assurance rested on the solid fact that they commanded the obedience of the majority among the delegates.

The contingent that arrived from London was truly international. Apart from Marx and Engels, two other old and experienced Germans came: Eccarius and Lessner. There were nine Frenchmen. Four were Blanquists: Vaillant, Ranvier, Arnaud, and Courmet. The remaining five were Marx's partisans: Dupont, Serraillier, Johannard, Le Moussu, and Longuet. From London came two other Frenchmen who were not members of the General Council. The first was Raimond Wilmart, hiding under the name "Wilmot," and the second was Paul Vichard. Wilmart had the mandate of the illegal section in Bordeaux; Vichard's mandate remains obscure. Nettlau questions his membership in the International, though he was an ex-Communard.¹⁰ Of the five British delegates, only two can be counted among Marx's followers: Barry and the contentious Doctor Sexton. Hales, Roach, and Mottershead were at odds with the Marxian party. There were three other Londoners who numbered among Marx's staunchest partisans: Frankel, Wróblewski, and MacDonnell. Noticeably absent was Jung, the old congress veteran, who had withstood the admonishments to go to The Hague. According to Jung's later report, Marx and Engels saw him twice, insisting that even one vote could decide the battle, and therefore his presence was necessary. Cowell Stepney promised to pay the cost of his journey.¹¹

Next in numerical strength was the delegation from Germany, composed entirely of followers of Marx.¹² In a sense, Engels was its member, as he carried a mandate of the Breslau "section" (if there was one). The mandate from Crimmitschau was given to a Berlin delegate, Milke. Hepner, the co-editor of *Volksstaat*, carried the mandate of a section in New York. Also among the German delegates were Doctor Kugelmann; Cuno; the ex-Lassalleian Bernhard Becker; Gustav Ludwig, a student from Heidelberg; Josef Dietzgen, a worker-philosopher from Sieburg; the Berliner Hugo Friedlaender, who carried a mandate from Zurich; and Schumacher, who came as a representative of Solingen. Both Guillaume and Nettlau questioned the legitimacy of the German mandates.¹³

Austria-Hungary was represented by Heinrich Scheu from Vienna, Károly Farkas from Budapest, and Heinrich Oberwinder, appearing under the name "Ludwig Heim"; he represented a "Bohemian section." All three belonged to the Marx camp.

Along with the eleven Frenchmen who came from London, two came directly from France: Van Hœddeghe from Paris, appearing as "Walter," and Émile Dentraygues, "Swarm," from Toulouse. Three ex-Communards who had settled in Belgium strengthened the French contingent: Victor Cyrille, Frédéric Potel, appearing as "Lucain," and Eugene Louis Faillet, "Dumont." Faillet arrived on the last day of the congress with a mandate from Rouen. Of the five non-London Frenchmen, only Cyrille sided with the opposition.

Four delegates came from Switzerland: Guillaume and Schwitzguébel representing the Jura camp, and Becker and Duval from the Fédération Romande. Zhukovski came from Geneva, mandated by the section of propaganda and revolutionary action. He was allowed to attend only as an observer. The seven-member delegation from Belgium represented the moderate opposition to the General Council. It included: Brismée, Spingard, Van Den Abeele, Eberhardt, Coenen, Herman, and Fluse. The old veterans De Paepe and Hins were absent. The Belgians were supported by three Dutchmen, representing the new and still weak organization hosting the congress. These were: Victor Dave, Hendrik Gerhard, and Van Der Hout.

Four Spaniards represented the official federal council in Spain: Morago, Marselan, Farga-Pellicer, and Alerini. Lafargue came with the mandate of the pro-Marxian section in Madrid, also carrying a mandate from Lisbon. The Italians, as we know, boycotted the congress, but Cafiero came as an observer for his federation. Four delegates came from the United States. The official federal council there was represented by the German Sorge and the Frenchman Dereure. The other Frenchman, Sauva, represented the oppositional Section No. 2. William West was delegated by Section No. 12, but his mandate was canceled. Two other delegates, utter novices, complete the list of the congress members: Phil from Denmark and an Australian, W.E. Harcourt. He represented the recently formed Democratic Association, which declared its adherence to the principles of the International.

A striking preponderance of non-working-class delegates attended the congress, though this is not apparent from the official list, where various manual trades were often substituted for other occupations. So, for example, J.Ph. Becker was listed as a brushmaker, Guillaume as a printer. A French journalist commented with sarcasm: "De véritables ouvriers, il y en avait à peine. Il y avait des journalistes, des médecins, des déclassés, des declamateurs de clubs."¹⁴

Unlike the previous congresses, this one was sharply divided into partisans of the London Council—in fact, of its Marxian core and its opponents. The first were in a majority of two to one, or perhaps more. The opposition, though having a lesser number of mandates, represented whole federations, but it was weakened through diversity of principles, tactics, and degree of determination.

The congress lost a great deal of time verifying mandates. The most brutal treatment was meted out to the American, West. He defended the principles of his faction, in particular the principle of women's emancipation. If the International aimed at the emancipation of the working class, he said, both sexes must be included and sexual equality was the first step to freedom. Why should the International be opposed to free love? West rejected the principle that sections must have a membership of two-thirds of those who were wage earners. He thought that the best leaders do not come from the laboring class, but from the intellectual class, those who possessed the full knowledge of the faults and the vices of the existing social system. Sorge opposed West. He gave vent to his antipathy toward the "Yankees." The working class of America, according to

Sorge, was composed of several layers: first came the Irish; second, the Germans; third, the Negroes; and last the Yankees, who were "jobbers, loafers and idlers." West got the worst of this argument, and he seems to have antagonized the delegates. Forty-nine voted against his admission and eight abstained; not one of the already verified delegates voted in his favor.¹⁵ Eventually, he took a seat, along with Zhukovski and Cafiero, as an observer. The Yankees were not the only objects of Sorge's scorn. This man, in whose hands the helm of the International was soon to pass, detested the ubiquitous and bombastic French. In fact, their total number at the congress, despite the disaster of the Commune, exceeded that of any other nationality, and no less than half of the delegates spoke French. Their domination, Sorge wrote later, gave the congress a "gross and sometimes unpleasant liveliness."¹⁶ Also the English delegates protested against what they thought to be the monopolization by the French of the right to debate.

The congress and its members were the object of great curiosity. Dutch crowds followed them, gaping, says Sorge, as if they were "strange animals and monsters." Also Barry found that so strong was the feeling in some quarters against the International that children were warned not to carry articles of value in the streets. Yet, at the table d'hôte of his hotel the landlord called for a toast to the "success of the International," and he was joined enthusiastically by the "numerous and respectable company present."¹⁷

The evening before the official opening of the congress, Sunday, 1 September, was sacrificed to procedural questions, but the next three days were also used to clear up these matters, in particular the verification of the mandates. On Thursday morning, a public meeting took place at the congress hall. It was poorly attended by workers, who could leave their places of work only with great difficulty. In the afternoon of that day, the council's report was read in three languages: English, French, and German. It was much briefer than the reports to the previous congresses. The report was concerned mostly with the events of the Franco-German war and the Commune, and the resulting persecutions. Not a word was said about the internal conflicts.¹⁸

Only on Thursday afternoon and on Friday did the congress proceed to debate the various questions on the agenda. By that time, a number of delegates had left for home. The first question concerned the functions of the General Council. Guillaume defined the differences in that matter as a conflict of two great principles and currents of ideas. The first current saw in the International the creation of a group of men, united by a doctrine whose opponents were to be eliminated. According to the second, the International emanated from the workings of economic forces, leading to the formation of a community of sentiments, aspirations, and interests that bound the working class. Of course, only the second concept was the true one. There was no need for the international movement to be led by a General Council endowed with authority.¹⁹

Brismée presented the Belgian point of view: General Council, yes; any particular authority, no. Marx took the floor, arguing that such a solution would put

the International into the hands of undesirable elements—nonworkers, in particular, journalists (to which category presumably Brismée and other Belgians, belonged but not Marx or Engels, though both figured in the list of delegates as “publicists”). To prove the point that the General Council must function as the highest authority, Marx was ready to produce documentary evidence that the Belgian federation was guilty of the misuse of power and of nepotism (an allusion to Brismée and his two sons-in-law, paralleled by the trio Marx, Lafargue, and Longuet, who were much more disciplined than the Belgian trio). When it came to the vote, a solid majority decided in favor of strengthening the rights of the General Council.

Three Blanquist delegates and members of the General Council, Vaillant, Arnaud, and Courmet, proposed to add to the statutes of the association, as Section 7a, the recommendation of political action to be undertaken by the working class and its organization in an independent political party. This was passed by a large majority: thirty-six delegates voted for, five against, and eight delegates abstained. Thus, Resolution No. 9 of the London conference became part of the statutes.

Then, a singular motion caused surprise and even shock among the delegates. The motion was signed by eleven members of the congress: Marx, Engels, Wróblewski, MacDonnell, Sexton, Longuet, Lessner, Le Moussu, Serrailier, Dupont, and Barry (who called it later a “coup d’état”). The eleven formed the Marxist party in its true sense, though one of that party, Frankel, failed to sign the motion because he strongly disagreed with it. The motion proposed the transfer, for the year 1872–1873, of the seat of the General Council to New York. Engels spoke for the motion. London had served well as the seat of the General Council because only there was the council truly international. Only there could its members be safe from persecution and its papers safe from seizure. However, the factional dissensions in London had become so sharp that the seat must be transferred. The majority of the council members, in particular Marx and himself, were tired of the constant recriminations. Neither Brussels nor Geneva guaranteed the necessary safeguards, but New York did. A new and strong organization was emerging there, and it was more truly international than anywhere else in the world. The American federal council had Irish, French, German, Italian, and Swedish members in its midst, and it would soon include native Americans. What is more, the distance from Europe would make interference in the affairs of European organizations difficult, a fact that should please many. At the same time, the new General Council would have the right and the duty to appoint special representatives in Europe to act as liaisons with countries that required it.

The main opposition came from the London Blanquists, who well understood that the move was directed against their recently acquired position in the central authority of the International. Vaillant, their spokesman, regretted that so many valuable men refused to serve in the General Council any longer, but said that there were many other good members of the International in London from whom

the new General Council might be chosen. Eventually, two questions were put to the congress on this matter. The first question was: Should the seat of the Association be transferred from London? Twenty-six members present voted for, twenty-three voted against, and nine abstained. Although the yes votes had no absolute majority, the motion was considered passed and so the congress could proceed to the next question concerning the future seat of the General Council. Thirty delegates voted for New York, one voted for Barcelona, twelve abstained, and fourteen delegates, all the Blanquists and Frankel, voted for London. It is interesting to note that, along with Marx and his supporters, the Belgians, the Dutchman Dave, and Hales's friend Roach voted for the transfer to New York. It is clear that they saw in such a transfer the chance to reduce the authority of the General Council to practically nil. The Spaniards, the two Jura delegates, Johannard, and Sorge, each for reasons of his own, abstained in this vote.

All these crucial debates and votes took place on Friday, 6 September, the fifth day of the Congress, that is, a short time before its closure. The next day the congress elected members of the new council. Among the twelve elected were four Germans: Bertrand, Bolte, Carl, and Speyer; three Frenchmen: David, Dereure, and Levi  le; two Irishmen: Saint-Clair and Kavanagh; the Italian Fornaccieri; the Swede Laurel; and one native American, Ward. Marx's main friend and agent in New York, so prominent at the congress, was not elected, but cooptions had to follow and there was little doubt that he would soon enter the transferred Council. Guillaume wrote later, with a dose of malice, that Sorge's candidature was not opposed "by an order given by Marx to his friends," as Marx knew that "corporal Sorge," a most unpopular character, would fail to be elected.³⁰

The Blanquists suffered another defeat when they proposed to the congress a resolution that would make it the task of the International to prepare the working class for the great goal of revolution. This proposal united Marxists and antiauthoritarians against them. Thus collapsed the alliance between Marxists and Blanquists, which had lasted for over a year.

By Saturday morning, another substantial group of delegates had left The Hague. Vaillant and his three Blanquists friends, Eccarius, Mottershead, Sexton, Roach, and Barry had all left for London. Five of the German delegation went to attend the congress of their party. When it came to consideration of a most important matter, that of the alliance, the membership of the congress was reduced by one-third and the shortage of time was bound to have its effect. Two days earlier, a commission was elected to examine the matter. It consisted of five members: Cuno, Lucain, Walter, Vichard, and Splingard. Marx and Engels could count on the loyalty of the first four. The commission had at its disposal the report written by Engels and accepted by the General Council. The report asserted that the Alliance of Socialist Democracy was a secret society aiming to seize supreme power in the International. The hope of achieving that aim motivated Bakunin to vote at the Basel congress for the strengthening of the authority of the General Council. When that hope was frustrated, the conspirators

proceeded to achieve their aim by other means. They now preached "struggle against authority," "autonomy," and "anarchy." At the end, the report proposed to the congress that Bakunin and the other members of the Alliance be expelled from the International.²¹

The commission invited the "accused"—Guillaume, Schwitzguébel, Zhukovski, Morago, Marselan, and Farga-Pellicer—to speak. Engels, Marx, Wróblewski, Dupont, Serrailier, and Swarm gave evidence as "witnesses." The verdict of the commission was signed by Cuno, its chairman, and the two Frenchmen, Lucain and Vichard. Walter informed Cuno by letter that he had decided to withdraw his participation. Spingard not only refused his signature but sent a written protest.

The matter came to the forum of the congress in its last hours, at ten o'clock on Saturday evening. The verdict of the commission was that a secret alliance had existed and that its statutes contradicted the rules of the IWMA. Yet there was not sufficient evidence that the alliance was still in existence. Bakunin was found guilty of an attempt to found a secret organization, in which he was "perhaps" successful. In addition, he was guilty of another serious transgression of a moral nature. He resorted to "dishonest dealings with the aim of appropriating the whole or part of another person's property which constituted an act of fraud." The unnamed "person," as we know, was Lyubavin and the "property" amounted to 300 rubles. Bakunin, the verdict continued, practiced intimidation, in person or through agents, in order to avoid fulfilling his obligations (that is, the Russian translation of *Das Kapital*). On all these grounds the commission proposed to the congress that Bakunin be expelled from the IWMA. It was also proposed to expel Guillaume and Schwitzguébel in the conviction that "they still belong to a society called Alliance."

The commission's report and proposals contained curious contradictions, unbefitting a judicial body. It admitted lack of any certainty that the alliance was still in existence or even that Bakunin was successful in attempting to create such a society. Yet Guillaume and Schwitzguébel were to be condemned because of the conviction that they were members of the society. Spingard, in his protest, maintained that only one thing was established: Bakunin's attempt to organize a secret society within the International. Guillaume denounced the whole proceedings as tendentious, aiming to silence the congress minority, that is, "the real majority."

When it came to the crucial vote, only forty-two delegates took part. On the motion to expel Bakunin, twenty-seven voted for, seven voted against, and eight abstained. The majority included all the Londoners who were still present, Germans and Austrians, Frenchmen (including Walter, who was still at the congress), the Dane Phil, and the two men from Geneva, Becker and Duval. The minority consisted of five Belgians, Dave, and Cyrille. The abstentions were the four Spaniards, Guillaume, Schwitzguébel, Spingard, and Sauva.

Certain differences emerged on the vote to expel Guillaume. Dereure and MacDonnell, who had voted for the expulsion of Bakunin, now abstained, while

Sauva and Spingard voted against. Eventually, twenty-five members voted for, nine voted against, and eight abstained. In the case of Schwitzguébel, the majority became a minority. Dupont, Dereure, Frankel, Johannard, Longuet, Swarm, Serrailier, and Wilmot, all belonging to Marx's party, voted against expulsion, so that the number of opponents rose to seventeen, while fifteen voted for and ten members abstained. Thus, the only members expelled were Bakunin and Guillaume. The condemnation of the alliance and the expulsion of its main leaders, though it took place in the last moments of the congress, brought to an end formally the great struggle within the International that had torn it apart in the course of the last three years. Admittedly, apart from the leaders, the participants on both sides were not quite aware, or were even ignorant, of the great principles involved. They acted mostly as proponents of discipline and authority, or as champions of freedom and autonomy of action and organization. Greater clarity of issues emerged in the coming years and decades. The Hague Congress ended amid shouts: "Vive l'Association internationale des travailleurs!"

A number of delegates left The Hague for Amsterdam, where on Sunday, 8 September, a large meeting took place. The speakers were: Marx, Becker, Duval, Wróblewski, Lafargue, Dupont, Sorge, and Van Der Hout. Marx's speech drew the greatest attention of the audience and also of the press. It remains one of the most important landmarks in the history of the Marxist doctrine.

Marx propounded the idea of a revolution aiming at the seizure of political power and the constitution of an "organization of labor." But, said Marx, there were various roads, in consideration of the institutions, mores, and traditions of the various countries. This applied, in particular, to the United States, Great Britain, and, probably, Holland, that is, to countries where workers could achieve their great aims by peaceful means. However, in most countries of the European continent, force had to become the lever of "our revolutions" aiming to secure the domination of labor. It remains a controversial question whether Marx proclaimed an important principle or whether he tried to win over his Dutch and also wider audiences by a relatively moderate declaration. Of some importance were Marx's observations, in the same speech, on the transfer of the General Council to New York. America, he said, would become the workers' continent par excellence, and the International was bound to take root there. The new General Council would possess the right to coopt members useful to the common cause, and, hopefully, these would be men equal to the task and capable of upholding the banner of the International in Europe.²²

If we consider these words in the light of what Engels said at the congress two days earlier, we may guess the true intentions of the two leaders. They expected the General Council in New York to exercise only nominal power and to leave decisions on most important matters in the hands of their European plenipotentiaries, that is, themselves, helped by a small team of their most trusted partisans.

The Hague Congress had one immediate result: the split of the organization of the International. On 15 September, only eight days after the closure of the congress in The Hague, a congress of the Jura federation assembled at St. Imier. It was attended by sixteen delegates, Guillaume and Bakunin among them. It declared null and void the resolutions passed at The Hague, in particular the expulsions, which resulted from a "miserable and infamous intrigue concocted by men filled with hatred." The congress refused to recognize the "authoritarian powers" of the General Council and declared its determination to work for the establishment of a "federative and free pact" between all the federations that would wish to participate in it.²³

One hour after the conclusion of that congress, there began in the same place the "Internationalist Federalist Congress," attended by fifteen delegates: four from the Spanish federations, Alerini, Farga-Pellicer, Marselan, and Morago (the same men who were at The Hague); Guillaume and Schwitzguébel, representing the Jura Federation; six representatives of the Italian Federation, Costa, Cafiero, Bakunin, Malatesta, Nabruzzi, and Fanelli; Pindy and Camet, representing a "number of sections in France"; and Lefrançais, the ex-Communist living in Geneva, who carried mandates of two American sections. Of the Hague "minority," absent were the Belgians and the Dutch, while the Italians and the French brought additional strength. That congress, too, rejected the resolutions passed in The Hague and refused to acknowledge the powers bestowed on the new General Council. Recognizing that within the International "an authoritarian party," that is, the party of "German Communism," tended to substitute the free and spontaneous organization of the proletariat with its domination and that of its leaders, the delegates in the name of their federations and sections proclaimed a "pact of friendship, solidarity and mutual defence." They appealed to other organizations to join the pact. The congress proclaimed its principle on the "political action of the proletariat." It considered that each political organization could only have the purpose of domination "to the profit of classes and to the detriment of the masses." The proletariat, if it wanted to take political power, would itself become a dominating and exploiting class.²⁴

After the Jurassians, the Spaniards were the first to ratify the pact at the congress of their federation, which took place in Cordoba from 25 December 1872 to 2 January 1873. At that congress, the federal council was replaced by a commission empowered to deal only with the exchange of correspondence and the gathering of statistics. The delegates sent fraternal greetings to the concurrent congress of the Belgian federation and, in return, they received a telegram: "Long live St. Imier! Autonomy and federation!"

The center in Madrid, led by José Mesa and still in possession of *Emancipación*, tried to counteract. It mobilized on its side several sections, which allowed a federal council to be proclaimed. It claimed to be the sole representative of the IWMA in Spain. Mesa and his friends denounced their rivals as tools of the bourgeoisie, as they were using their antiauthoritarian

platform for the purpose of destroying the greatest working-class organization in history.

Major historical events pushed the Spanish International into the limelight. On 11 February 1873 a republic was proclaimed in Spain. The victorious Republicans were divided into centralists (unitarians), federalists, and partisans of extreme, "cantonal" autonomy. The young republic was attacked by monarchists, some of whom resorted to arms. The new Constituent Assembly proclaimed, in June, a federal republic. Members of the International had to declare their stand in all these struggles. The Marxists had no hesitation in giving their support to the federalists, in particular as one of their leaders, Pi y Margall, the interior minister and later the prime minister, was close to Socialism. This contradicted curiously the stand taken by the General Council in New York, which in its address and annual report warned against the "heroes of parliamentary comedy" at the head of affairs in Madrid.²⁶

The Bakuninists warned against participation in politics, yet they supported in various places the cantonalists. The general weakness of the Republican camp and dissensions within it brought about the downfall of the republic and restoration of the monarchy in 1874. Working-class organizations, including the International, became objects of persecution. When conditions relaxed, the old antagonism between the anarchists and the marxists revived with even greater force.²⁷

The first post-Hague congress of the Belgian federation took place in Brussels on 25 and 26 December 1872. It gathered the most important leaders. De Paepe, absent at The Hague Congress, came to this congress. He had tried to adopt a neutral position and opposed the stand of the majority in the federation. Nevertheless, he was angered by the resolutions adopted at The Hague.²⁸ The report of the Belgian federal council was couched in sharp words, directed against the Marxian camp. The proceedings of The Hague congress and its results were denounced as an odious coup d'état, engendered by a conspiracy formed within the London Council, composed of Germans and Frenchmen, all of them bowing before Karl Marx. On the other side were Spaniards, Dutch, the Jura, Swiss, and Belgians, all "defenders of pure revolutionary ideas, Anarchists, enemies of all authoritarian centralisation and indomitable partisans of autonomy, that of individuals and federations." After a heated debate, the resolutions of the congress in The Hague were declared null and void, the New York General Council was refused recognition, and access to the Saint-Imier pact was approved.²⁹ As time went on, the Belgian federation developed along an independent path, giving way eventually to new forms of working-class and Socialist organization.

The Dutch federal council, at the head of the young organization, conducted a referendum on the resolutions of The Hague congress. In February, Gerhard, the secretary of the council, informed the General Council in New York that of the four sections, those in Amsterdam, The Hague, and Rotterdam were in favor of the minority, while only the section at Utrecht took the side of the majority. In consequence, the Dutch federal council, while not refusing recognition or pay-

ment of contributions to the New York council, denied it the right to suspend or exclude sections and federations.³⁰ This was the most moderate expression by the opposition of its attitudes and views. Soon, the Dutch movement, like the Belgian, took the course toward full independence.

The Italian federation assembled at a congress on 15–17 March 1873 in Bologna. It was attended by delegates from a number of local federations, in addition to individual sections. The congress accepted the principles of anarchism, in particular “atheism and materialism” and the negation of the state. The congress denounced the imposition on the International by “authoritarian Communism” of its political and social program.

Of greater complexity were affairs in France. Marx’s enemies in France and elsewhere obtained some valuable trump cards. Two members of The Hague congress majority—Van Heddeghem, “Walter” (from Paris), and Dentraygues, “Swarm” (from Toulouse)—became compromised. Walter was unmasked as a police spy. Swarm was accused by his excomrades of appropriating funds, and when the public prosecutor questioned him, he proceeded to denounce some of his accusers to the authorities. This led to trials and sentences.³¹ In a letter to Sorge, Marx complained despairingly that Walter was a spy and Swarm, though not a spy, became a police informer.³² In December 1872, a short time before these scandals erupted, Walter and Swarm became plenipotentiaries of the New York General Council upon recommendations received from London. Now, the Blanquists were accused of responsibility for Walter and for recommending him to Marx and Engels.

Soon after their return from The Hague to London, the Blanquists issued a brochure *The International and Revolution*. Claiming to be the revolutionary party, they declared their secession from the International, which had not succeeded in its task of becoming the “vanguard of the revolutionary proletariat.” The Blanquist manifesto proclaimed, at the end, the organization in France and in all countries of a most militant workers’ party around the flag of social revolution.³³

Of greater importance was the split within the British federation. Inside the federal council, leaders who had previously been at odds formed an alliance, on both political and personal grounds. The alliance embraced the two rivals, Hales and Mottershead; Eccarius and Jung, the former friends of Marx, who had recently broken with him; the old Owenite Weston; and others.³⁴ The most conspicuous among their opponents were Lessner, Murray, Milner, Barry, and Dupont. Developments outside Britain had a strong impact. In November 1872, Hales, the secretary of the British federation, sent a letter to the Jura federation in answer to their circular sent out after the congress of St. Imier. Hales declared his approval of the principles of federalism and autonomy, but did not hesitate to outline the differences in ideas. The English workers believed in the usefulness of political action, which gave them limitation of hours of labor, prohibition of child labor, inspection of work in the mines, and similar legislation. They would pursue, therefore, the aim of acquiring political power in order to achieve their

emancipation. Workers in other countries would have arrived at the same views, had they lived under the same conditions. At the same time, Hales denounced the Marx party who, he said, had tried to organize a vast secret society within the International under the pretext of destroying another secret society whose existence they invented to further their cause. Hales expressed his desire to correspond with and work with the Jura federation. Schwitzguébel, who answered Hales, agreed that the existing conditions in each country, as well as its history, should determine the workers' principles and tactics.³⁵

That correspondence brought about the formal breakup of the British federation. Hales and his friends were strongest in the East End of London and had some provincial branches behind them. The friends of Marx and Engels drew their support from the West End of London, Nottingham, Manchester, and a few other places. In Manchester, three sections formed a federation whose secretary was Engels's friend, Edward Jones; one of the sections, comprising Germans and Frenchmen, was led by Dupont. Numerically, all these sections were weak.³⁶

In January 1873, a congress of the British federation took place in London. There were only twelve participants. It was uninteresting, except for one dramatic incident. Jung, who participated in it, reported on his break with Marx after a long comradeship. He blamed Engels for the adverse influence on Marx, who had stopped consulting his friends. Marx passed the reins of the International into the hands of a man in New York, Sorge, whom he himself had recently called "a stupid ass."³⁷ Marx, in a bitter comment, called Jung's speech "an old ladies' gossip web of lies, distortions and stupidity."³⁸

The pro-Marxian faction had its congress in Manchester on 1 and 2 June 1873. It was attended by twenty delegates. The congress concentrated on denouncing the "secessionists" and passed a number of semirevolutionary resolutions. One of them proclaimed the red flag to be the standard of labor. By the end of 1873, the demise of both wings was clearly visible. In the summer of next year, Marx informed Sorge that the International in England "is as good as dead," at least for the time being.³⁹

Let us turn to Germany, potentially the strongest territory of the labor and Socialist movement. Though the Germans came in great strength to The Hague to support Marx, only a few of them remained to participate at the crucial votes on the last day of the congress. Those who left rushed away to take part in their own party's congress. It assembled in Mainz on Saturday, 7 September, a most important and decisive day in The Hague. The German Social Democrats remained engrossed in their own affairs. Their leaders, Bebel and Liebknecht, were still imprisoned in the Hubertsburg Fortress. The seat of the party's executive moved to Hamburg, where the ex-Lassalleans were strongest. There was no enthusiasm in Germany for the condemnations and expulsions at The Hague congress. The still surviving Lassalleans and their organ, *Der Neue Social-Demokrat*, sided with the anti-Marxian opposition and denounced what happened in The Hague. Yet these were rather marginal concerns. The Eisenachers

returned to their purely "moral" adhesion to the International, which was, however, rapidly disintegrating. Moreover, the two wings of the German Socialist movement had to face increasing persecution from the Bismarck regime. Once the course of German history was decided and the German Reich became an unalterable fact, the ideological and tactical differences became more and more irrelevant. The ground became ripe for full unification. This happened at the Congress of Gotha between 22 and 27 May 1875, at a time when the First International was no longer in existence (if we ignore false claims about its continuation).

The process of disintegration in Europe was watched from afar by the helpless General Council in New York. Its composition had changed since the appointments at The Hague. Sorge was coopted within a month of the New York council's existence, and he was given the post of general secretary. The Frenchman David and the American Ward refused their mandates, and Fornaccieri left after a short time. Of the two remaining Frenchmen, Levièle, who became the treasurer, vanished with the funds (later returned) and Dereure left New York. The Irishman Saint-Clair, who took minutes at the first meetings, left the council but refused to hand over any documents in his possession. The council was thus reduced to seven members: five Germans, one Swede, and one Irishman. Lack of sufficient funds paralyzed its activities. "Having accepted the tasks of the General Council, we found at our disposal only debts," the council complained in its address of 27 October 1872.⁴⁰ Indeed, the financial report of the London General Council to the congress in The Hague showed a balance of £4 and 7 shillings, but there were outstanding debts.⁴¹ Despite appeals, subscriptions from Europe were not forthcoming. On 20 March 1873, Engels, now the council's plenipotentiary, wrote to Sorge: "Regarding the payments for the General Council, I have not received a penny yet."⁴² The American federation was the only one that met its obligations.

Though Sorge was most keen to satisfy all the demands of his chiefs in London, the Londoners were by no means satisfied with his and the New York council's work. In the council itself, Bolte and Carl revolted against the role of being obedient tools. Marx and Engels refused to send to New York the archives of the International at their disposal. They claimed that they were necessary to them for their work of repudiating the lies of their numerous adversaries.⁴³ The General Council could not find in its midst corresponding secretaries for the European countries. Sorge tried to fill that role in part, but the main tasks were executed by Marx, Engels, and Serrailier. Sorge instructed the organizations in Germany to send all their correspondence destined for the General Council into the hands of Karl Marx in London. Eccarius, when he learned about it, wrote critically in his correspondence to *The World*, in its issue of 1 February 1873: "The meaning of this is that Karl Marx is still the ruler of the International and that the Council in New York is only a servant."⁴⁴

The relations between New York and London are well illustrated by the case of Poland. The General Council endeavoured to establish direct relations with

an organization supposedly existing there. In a letter, dated 1 December 1872, Sorge appealed for names, addresses, and other personal details of persons in Poland who could be authorized to receive powers from the General Council. Wróblewski was asked to pass the request to Poland. Soon Marx informed Sorge that any liaison with the Poles must be carried out only through Wróblewski, who ought to receive an unconditional mandate.⁴⁵ In February 1873 such a mandate was dutifully sent and at that the matter ended.

Marx insisted on convening the next congress in Geneva, where he and his partisans could rely on his old friend Johann Philipp Becker. Becker assured Marx that in Geneva "we have the mass of workers behind us" and that the "gentlemen of the Alliance would be simply thrown out, if they presented themselves." Becker was instructed to form a large phalanx of his followers in face of the danger that the Bakuninist Lumpenbande [rabble] might appear there en masse.⁴⁶ The General Council, under constant pressure from London, excluded some federations from the congress. The federations that had recently held congresses in Brussels, Cordoba, and London were considered to have excluded themselves from the IWMA.

Contrary to Marx's expectations and fears, the congress in 1873 was not well attended. The General Council lacked funds to subsidize the journey of even one delegate, and Serrailier was authorized to represent the council. At the end of August, the suspicion arose that he might be the only delegate from outside Switzerland. Perret and some of his comrades came to recognize that the transfer of the General Council's seat to New York was wrong, and they wanted to reverse that decision at the coming congress with a view to establishing the newly elected authority in Switzerland. It seems that Hales and Jung were in collusion with Perret on this matter. They also established contact with the oppositional American council, seated at Spring Street in New York. A report of that council's meeting disclosed the contents of a letter received from London that recommended that "the central body of the order be in Switzerland" and expressed regret that "through the action of Messrs. Marx and Ingalls [sic] the split in the Society has been very great."⁴⁷

The congress in Geneva convened on 7 September and closed on the thirteenth.⁴⁸ Of the thirty delegates, only three came from abroad: Oberwinder from Vienna, Van Den Abeele from Brussels, and Theodor Burckhard from Stuttgart. A number of Swiss delegates carried mandates from other countries. Van Den Abeele had the mandate of the Dutch federation, but his intention to come to that "authoritarian" congress was to present there, according to his own words, an ultimatum and to find out whether there were among the delegates some who would put the cause of revolution above personal animosities.⁴⁹ According to one historian, Van Den Abeele became, after the Hague congress, a police spy.⁵⁰

The congress adopted the procedures of the former congresses. A report of the General Council was read and debated, and matters of organization and program were discussed. In fact, it was a poor imitation and no more than a shadow of the past congresses. The proceedings were dominated by the rivalry of the two

Geneva factions, one called the "German Tendency" and the other the "French Tendency." The German-speaking faction around Becker succeeded in confirming the present seat of the General Council. A little later, in a letter to Sorge, Becker described his own importance in his exaggerated manner. It was due to him that the congress had been saved from failure. He conjured up a number of delegates from nowhere ("aus der Erde gestampft") in order to increase the number of delegates and to secure the success of the majority. The congress, he assured Sorge, succeeded beyond his expectation.⁵¹

Marx was of a different opinion. Writing to Sorge about the same time, he assessed the congress as an inevitable "fiasco." He suggested that the formal organization be allowed to slip into the background, but to keep well in hand the "central point" in New York, so that it did not fall into the hands of "idiots like Perret or adventurers like Cluseret." Inevitably, the International, "in an improved form," would rise again.⁵²

The federalists held their congress in Geneva, a week earlier than their rivals, between 1 and 6 September (which allowed Van Den Abeele to be at both congresses, in succession).⁵³ By comparison with the "centralist" congress, it was an imposing and truly international gathering. Five delegates each represented Belgium, France, and Spain; four represented Italy; one, Holland; and ten, the Jura federation. Hales and Eccarius came from England. Paul Brousse, a French émigré from Barcelona, represented both France and Spain. The congress declared the abolition of the General Council "in its actual form." A revised text of statutes was accepted in which one article, No. 8, provided that between congresses the federations would perform the function of the "Federal Bureau" to deal with problems of statistics, correspondence, and liaison between federations, also with the preparation of the next congress. Only the Belgian delegation opposed such a solution, preferring that such functions be distributed among several federations. Interestingly, the Belgian federation was chosen to provide the first federal bureau for the coming year.

The next federalist congress in Brussels, between 7 and 13 September 1874, sealed the failure of that experiment. There were sixteen delegates, of whom only two came from abroad: Eccarius and the Spaniard "Gomez" Vinas. That congress completed the demise of the International after ten years of turbulent history. A new phase started, that of a search for new forms and contents for the modern proletarian movement, both in national and international dimensions. Contacts between countries were maintained and even international congresses were convened, though irregularly and without the backing of a formal international organization. A new phase began in 1889 with the foundation of another workers' international, rooted in mass parties and spread throughout Europe, America, and other continents.

The General Council in New York led a shadowy existence until August 1874, when Sorge resigned the office of general secretary. Informed of the resignation by Sorge, Engels replied: "With your departure the old International is anyhow completely finished [abgeschlossen und zu Ende]."⁵⁴ The formal dis-

solution of the IWMA took place at a meeting, which described itself as a "delegates' conference," on 15 July 1876. Ten men were present, all Germans, Sorge among them. The conference issued a short address proclaiming the dissolution of the International. It ended with the famous slogan: "Proletarians of all countries, unite!"⁵⁵

Two months later, Becker issued another address with the heading: "Die Internationale Arbeiterassoziation. Zentralkomitee der Sektionen deutscher Sprache." The address rejected an anarchist initiative to convene a "congress of reconciliation." There were differences of principles that prevented any coming together. The anarchists rejected the state, while Socialist Democracy, which was based on scientific principles, aimed to achieve the true idea of a state, that is, the people's state (Volksstaat). Becker praised the old International because it had gathered together workers of all "lands of culture" and rooted that movement in social science. The new task was to achieve international unification on the "basis of independent national parties." Perhaps this time, for once, Becker made a correct prognosis of the future.⁵⁶

Note: ed.(s.) means, normally, also the author(s) of the introduction and of the notes; ed.(s.)-in-chief means, normally, also the coauthor(s) of the introduction and of the notes.

ABBREVIATIONS

- DMB** *Documents relatifs aux militants belges de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs; Correspondance, 1865–1872*, ed. Daisy Eveline Devreese, Louvain-Brussels, 1986.
- EDS** *Études et documents sur la Première Internationale en Suisse*, ed. Jacques Freymond, Geneva, 1964.
- "1871"** "1871, Jalons pour une histoire de la Commune de Paris," ed.-in-chief Jacques Rougerie, *IRSH*, vol. 17, 1972.
- GC.Min** *The General Council of the First International; Minutes, 1864–1872*, vols. 1–5, eds. Institute of Marxism-Leninism, Moscow, n.d. (1960s).
- IRSH** *International Review of Social History*, Amsterdam.
- MEW** Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels, *Werke*, vols. 15–19 cover writings from 1860–1883, vols. 30–34 cover correspondence from 1860–1883, eds. Institute of Marxism-Leninism, Moscow; publ. Berlin, 1964–1969.
- PI.IIR** *La Première Internationale; l'institution, l'implantation, le rayonnement, Colloque International, 16–18 Septembre, 1964*, ed.-in-chief Ernest Labrousse, Paris, 1968.
- PI.Rec** *La Première Internationale; recueil de documents*, ed.-in-chief Jacques Freymond; vols. 1–2, 1864–1872, eds. Henri Burgelin, Knut Langfeldt, Miklós Molnár, Geneva, 1962; vols. 3–4, 1872–1877, eds. Bert Andréas, Miklós Molnár, Geneva, 1971.

1. THE FOUNDATION

1. *MEW*, vol. 19, p. 100.

2. Vésinier Collection (IISG, Amsterdam), letter to Spehl, 27 Sept. 1868.

3. *Ibid.*, letter to L'Espiègle, 13 Jan. 1867.

4. Becker's letter to Friedrich Sorge, 30 May 1867, in *Briefe und Auszuege aus Briefen von Joh. Phil. Becker, Jos. Dietzgen, Friedrich Engels, Karl Marx u.A. an F.A. Sorge und Andere*, Stuttgart, 1906, p. 1.

5. B. Malon, *L'Internationale, son histoire et ses principes*, Neuchâtel, 1872, p. 7.

6. An account unsurpassed in detail and documentation of the rise of the International is to be found in D. Rjasanoff, "Die Entstehung der Internationalen Arbeiter-Assoziation zur Geschichte der Ersten Internationale," in *Marx-Engels Archiv*, vol. 1, Frankfurt a.M., 1925, pp. 119–202.

7. A detailed account of this matter is found in Henryk Katz, "Die englische Arbeiter, der polnische nationale Aufstand von 1863 und die Entstehung der Ersten Internationale," in *Beitraege zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung*, No. 5, Berlin, 1966, pp. 846–860.

8. *Beehive*, 25 July 1863.

9. The biographical details were compiled from various sources: Howell's autobiographic manuscript (Howell Library, Bishopsgate Institute, London), biographical articles printed in the *Commonwealth* (London) in the course of 1866, the *National Dictionary of Biography*, and some writings by Sidney and Beatrice Webb, G.D.H. Cole, and others.

10. *Beehive*, 5 Dec. 1863.

11. Royden Harrison, *Before the Socialists; Studies in Labour and Politics, 1861–1881*, ch. 6 "The Positivists, a Study in Labour Intellectuals," London, 1965, pp. 251–342.

12. Howell's letter to P.A. Taylor, 18 Nov. 1865, Reform League Archive (Howell Library), London.

13. James Guillaume, *L'Internationale, documents et souvenirs, 1864–1878*, vol. 1, Paris, 1905, p. 42.

14. Marx-Engels Coll., IISG, Amsterdam, D 2504.

15. Letter dated 4 Nov. 1864 in *MEW*, vol. 31, p. 13.

16. Short biographical sketches of Tolain and other French leaders are in *Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français*, ed.-in-chief Jean Maitron, *Deuxième période, la Première Internationale et la Commune*, vols. 4–9, Paris, 1964–1971. Various other sources are listed in the Bibliography, in particular books by E. Fribourg, G. Weill, and J. Guillaume.

17. J.L. Puech, *Le proudhonisme dans l'A.I.T.*, Paris, 1907; E. Dolléans, *Pierre-Joseph Proudhon*, Paris, 1950; *L'actualité de Proudhon*, Colloque 1965, Brussels, 1967.

18. Henri Tolain, *Quelques vérités sur les élections de Paris*, Paris, 1863.

19. Czartoryski Archives (Cracow), 5696 k. 485 n.

20. *Troisième procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs à Paris*, Paris, 1870, p. 126.

21. *GC.Min.*, vol. 1, meetings of 28 Feb. and 7 March 1865, pp. 75–79; also an interesting memorandum by Marx to Jung, pp. 265–270.

22. Maurice Dommanget, *Les idées politique et sociales d'Auguste Blanqui*, ch. 3 "Le socialisme de Blanqui," Paris, 1957.
23. E.E. Fribourg, *L'Association internationale des travailleurs*, Paris, 1871, p. 33.
24. *GC.Min.*, vol. 1, pp. 163–164.
25. *Ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 140.
26. My description of Swiss affairs is based on: E. Gruner, *Die Arbeiter in der Schweiz im 19 Jahrhundert*, Bern, 1968; *Études et documents sur la Première Internationale en Suisse*, ed. Jacques Freymond, Geneva, 1964; J. Guillaume, *L'Internationale, documents et souvenirs, 1864–1878*, vols. 1–4, Paris, 1905–1910; Becker Collection in IISG, Amsterdam, and other sources, cited below.
27. Gruner, *Die Arbeiter*, p. 552.
28. Marc Monier, "Genève et genevois," *Revue des Deux Mondes* (Paris), 15 Dec. 1868.
29. Becker Collection, C8; Anon., *Biographie des alten Veteran der Freiheit, Johann Philipp Becker*, Zurich, 1889; R. Morgan in his *The German Social Democrats and the First International, 1864–1872*, Cambridge, 1965, treats the personality of J.P. Becker at great length.
30. *Vorhote*, No. 2, February, 1866.
31. *La Voix de l'Avenir*, 31 Dec. 1865; Elfriede Wiss-Belleville, *Pierre Coullery und die Anfänge der Arbeiterbewegung in Bern und der Westschweiz*, Basel-Frankfurt a.M., 1987.
32. James Guillaume, *Le collectivisme de l'Internationale*, Neuchâtel, 1904, pp. 3–4.
33. The following sources of the origins and course of the International in Belgium were used: Belgische Federatie, a section in Jung Collection, IISG in Amsterdam; Louis Bertrand, *Histoire de la démocratie et du socialisme en Belgique depuis 1830*, vols. 1–2, Brussels-Paris, 1907; C. Oukhov, ed., *Documents relatifs à l'histoire de la Première Internationale en Wallonie*, Louvain-Paris, 1967; H. Wouters, ed., *Documenten betreffende de geschiedenis der arbeidersbeweging ten tijde van de le Internationale, 1866–1880*, vols. 1–2, Louvain-Paris, 1967–1971; *GC.Min.*, vols. 1–4; H. Collin-Dajch, "Contribution à l'étude de la Première Internationale à Bruxelles, 1865–1873," in *Cahiers Bruxellois*, vol. 1, 1956; D.E. Devreese, "Een onderzoek naar invloed en reactie, het voorbeeld van militanten van de arbeidersbeweging, België 1830–1884," in *Medelingenblad*, No. 4, 1974; D.E. Devreese, "Vestiging van het IWB in België 1865–1868," *Tijdschrift voor sociale geschiedenis*, No. 4, Feb. 1976; D.E. Devreese, ed., *Documents relatifs aux militants belges de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs: Correspondance 1865–1872*, Louvain-Paris, 1986.
34. *Le Peuple, Association de la Démocratie Militante*, ch. "Profession de foi," Brussels, n.d.
35. L. Bertrand, *Histoire*, vol. 2, ch. 5 "Le mouvement des idées socialistes"; G.D.H. Cole, *Marxism and Anarchism*, vol. 2 of *A History of Socialist Thought*, London, 1957, ch. 4 "Belgian Socialism in the 1850s." See also the interesting letter by De Paepe to Brouez, in *DMB*, pp. 40–44.
36. B. Dandois, ed. *Entre Marx et Bakounine*, Paris, 1974, pp. 64–65.
37. *La Rive Gauche*, 13 August 1865.
38. "Belgische Federatie"; *DMB*, pp. 1–18.
39. Marx-Engels Coll., D3609.
40. Wouters, *Documenten 1866–1880*, vol. 1, pp. 5–11.

41. Both texts in *GC.Min.*, vol. 1, pp. 277–291; discussion of program and rules, *ibid.*, pp. 38–44.
42. Minutes of the conference are published in *GC.Min.*, vol. 1, pp. 231–250. A report was published in *Workman's Advocate* (London), 30 Sept. 1865. Many details related to the conference are in H. Jung's letter to Écho de Verviers of 15 Feb. 1866, translated into English and reprinted in *GC.Min.*, vol. 1, pp. 317–326.
43. *La Presse*, 7 July, 1865; *L'Opinion Nationale*, 15 July 1865.
44. Jung Coll., f 138.
45. Écho de Verviers, 16 Dec. 1865.
46. Vésinier Coll., Supplement VI.
47. Two semiofficial reports on the proceedings of the congress were published. The first, authorized by the General Council, was published in the London organ of the International, *Le Courier International*. The second, was written by Card-Cwierciakiewicz and published as a brochure in Geneva. Both texts are republished in *La Première Internationale; Recueil de documents*, vol. 1, ed.-in-chief Jacques Freymond, Geneva, 1962, pp. 25–84. The Jung Collection, ff 8–64, contains written reports, signed by Jung and Card, which probably served as a source for the two publications. They contain many interesting details that are omitted elsewhere. A separate report was published by *Vorbote* between September and November 1866. A short report written by Varlin was published by *Mutualité* (Paris) of 15 October 1866. Some other sources are cited below.
48. The text entitled *Instructions for the Delegates of the Provisional General Council: The Different Questions* is republished in *GC.Min.*, vol. 1, pp. 340–351.
49. Text of this memorial, reconstructed on the basis of two versions of it, entitled “Mémoire des délégués français,” in *PLRec.*, vol. 1, pp. 85–108.
50. *Vorbote*, No. 11, Nov. 1866, pp. 165–166.
51. *MEW*, vol. 31, pp. 529–530.

2. METAMORPHOSES

1. *GC.Min.*, vol. 2, p. 36.
2. *La Tribune du Peuple* (Brussels), 16 Sep. 1866, printed an article titled “Apel des garçons coiffeurs de Londres à leur camarades ouvriers continentaux.”
3. *GC.Min.*, vol. 1, p. 348.
4. *Ibid.*, vol. 2, pp. 90–99.
5. Letter dated 13 Oct. 1866, *MEW*, vol. 31, p. 534.
6. Reform League Archive (Howell Coll.), *Annual Report and Balance Sheet*, April 1867.
7. Letter dated 5 Nov. 1866, in Reform League Correspondence (Howell Coll.).
8. *MEW*, vol. 31, p. 530.
9. *GC.Min.*, vol. 2, pp. 61, 65.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 157.
11. Marx's letter to Engels of 10 Feb. 1866, *MEW*, vol. 31, p. 175.
12. *Commonwealth*, 13 Jan. 1867.
13. *Procès de l'Association internationale des travailleurs; première et deuxième commission du Bureau de Paris*, Paris, 1870, pp. 42–43.
14. *La Voix de l'Avenir*, 26 May 1867.

15. Most of the information on the French sections of that period is contained in the reports to the Lausanne congress, *Pl.Rec.*, vol. 1, pp. 165–168, 175–182; *GC.Min.*, vol. 2; papers submitted to the Conference on the First International, Paris, Nov. 1964, by Jacques Rougerie, in the name of a research team, entitled “Les sections françaises de l’Association Internationale des Travailleurs”; and by Jean Maitron, “Les effectifs de la Première Internationale en France.” Both papers, with annexes and discussions, printed in *PI.IIR*, pp. 93–119.

16. *Pl.Rec.*, vol. 1, p. 177.

17. *Procès de l’Association*, p. 129.

18. E.E. Fribourg, *L’Association internationale des travailleurs*, Paris, 1871, p. 67.

19. Allan’s letter to Jung dated 4 April 1867, in Jung Coll. f 417; Guile’s letter, *ibid.* f 662.

20. Letter dated 1 April 1867, Marx-Engels Coll. D 2980.

21. *GC.Min.*, vol. 2, pp. 43, 70, 79–80, and 84–85. The text of an article on the affair, written by André Fox by order of the General Council and published in the *Commonwealth*, 12 Jan. 1867, and in the *Working Man*, 1 Feb. 1867, is reprinted in *GC.Min.*, vol. 2, pp. 271–276.

22. Fribourg, *L’Association*, pp. 116–119; Georges Weill, *Histoire du mouvement social en France, 1852–1902*, Paris, 1904, pp. 111–112.

23. *Procès de l’Association*.

24. Fribourg, *L’Association*, p. 120.

25. Sources relating to Switzerland of this period are the same as listed here in chapter 1 note 33, apart from additional sources indicated below.

26. Leaflet on this topic, in Becker Coll., DI 494.

27. *Briefe und Auszüge*, eds.-in-chief R. Dlubek and E. Stepanova, *Die Erste Internationale in Deutschland, 1864–1872, Dokumente und Materialien*, Berlin, 1964, pp. 181–182.

28. J.Ph. Becker, *Die Internationale Arbeiter-Association und die Arbeitseinstellung in Genf im Fruejahr 1868*, Geneva, 1868.

29. *La Liberté*, 17 July 1867.

30. *Ibid.*, 22 Sep. 1867.

31. *Mirabeau*, 1 December 1867.

32. Oukhov, ed., *Documents*, p. 167.

33. *MEW*, vol. 31, p. 23.

34. B. Becker, *Der grosse Arbeiter-Agitor Ferdinand Lassalle: Denkschrift fuer die Todesfeier des Jahres 1865*, Berlin, 1865, p. 19.

35. Most of the source material is to be found in the correspondence of Marx and Engels, *MEW*, vols. 31–32, and in *Die Erste Internationale in Deutschland*.

36. *Der Social-Demokrat*, 13 May 1868.

3. ENCOUNTERS: LAUSANNE AND BRUSSELS

1. *GC.Min.*, vol. 2, pp. 152–153.

2. Our account of the proceedings of the congress in Lausanne is based on a detailed report published in *La Chaux-de-Fonds* soon after its conclusion; reprinted in *Pl. Rec.*, vol. 1, pp. 109–236. Eccarius published a report in *The Times*. Another report

was published in *La Liberté*. Valuable material is contained in André Lassere and Marc Vuilleumier, *Centenaire du Congrès de Lausanne, 1867-1967*, Lausanne, 1967.

3. *MEW*, vol. 31, pp. 342-343.

4. *Ibid.*, p. 344.

5. *GC.Min.*, vol. 2, pp. 161, 166, and 371, f 211.

6. M. Dommanget, *Blanqui et l'opposition révolutionnaire à la fin du Second Empire*, Paris, 1960, p. 207.

7. Our account of the Brussels congress is based on the very comprehensive official report, printed originally in *Le Peuple Belge* (Brussels) from 6 to 30 September 1868, and reproduced in *PI.Rec.*, vol. 1, pp. 237-447. Other sources are quoted below.

8. Moses Hess, *Briefwechsel*, ed. E. Silberner, The Hague, 1959, pp. 565-568.

9. *GC.Min.*, vol. 3, p. 35.

10. *La Voix de l'Avenir*, 27 Sep. 1868, in an article entitled "Congrès international des travailleurs."

11. *PI.Rec.*, vol. 1, pp. 429-430.

12. *Vorbote*, Feb. 1869.

13. Letter to Engels, 16 Sept. 1868, *MEW*, vol. 32, pp. 150-151.

14. *PI.Rec.*, vol. 1, pp. 449-452.

4. THE HIGH TIDE

1. Letter dated 24 Sep. 1868, Becker Coll., DI 625.

2. *GC.Min.*, vol. 3, pp. 178-183, 185-190, 192-194.

3. *Ibid.*, pp. 50, 55.

4. *Die Erste Internationale in Deutschland*, p. 285.

5. *Vorbote*, August 1869.

6. *MEW*, vol. 32, p. 255.

7. *Die Erste Internationale in Deutschland*, pp. 361-362.

8. *Ibid.*, p. 332.

9. Letter dated 20 March 1869, Becker Coll., DI 235.

10. *Die Erste Internationale in Deutschland*, pp. 400-403.

11. *Ibid.*, p. 403.

12. *Ibid.*, p. 405.

13. M. Dommanget, *Blanqui et l'opposition révolutionnaire à la fin du Second Empire*, p. 220.

14. Varlin's letter to Hins, 28 Jan. 1870, Descaves Collection (IISG); *Lettres d'Eugène Varlin à Albert Richard*, ed. E. Dolleans, *IRSH*, vol. 2, 1937.

15. Malon's article: "Socialisme, de l'organisation du travail," in *La Marseillaise*, 25 July 1870.

16. James Guillaume, "Lettre au Citoyen Murat," *Progrès*, Jan. 1870.

17. Letter to Aubry, quoted in *Troisième Procès*, pp. 25-27.

18. Jung Coll. f 433.

19. *Troisième Procès*, pp. 136-137.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 169.

21. *PI.IJR*, p. 111.

22. C. Oukov, ed., *Documents*, p. 69.

23. Association Internationale des Travailleurs, Section Liègoise, *Appel aux ouvriers*, Liège, 1869, p. 10.

24. Text of the address, *GC.Min.*, vol. 3, pp. 312–318.
25. *Entre Marx et Bakounine: César De Paepe; Correspondance*, ed., B. Dandois, Paris, 1974, p. 68; *DMB*, pp. 78–79, 197–198.
26. De Paepe's letter to Jung, 7 Jan. 1869, *DMB*, pp. 109–110.
27. "Adresse des travailleurs belges aux travailleurs réunis à Lyon, le 13 Mars 1870," in *Progrès*, 26 March 1870.
28. Wilfried Haerberli, "Die Internationale Arbeiter-Assoziation in Basel, 1866–1871," in *EDS*, pp. 91–92, 119–120.
29. Hess, *Briefwechsel*, p. 579.
30. *GC.Min.*, vol. 3, p. 68.

5. BAKUNIN IN THE INTERNATIONAL

1. *MEW*, vol. 31, p. 16.
2. *Ibid.*, vol. 16, p. 409.
3. Arthur Lehning, "La Lutte des tendances au sein de la Première Internationale; Marx et Bakounine," in *PIJIR*, p. 335.
4. *PI.Rec.*, vol. 1, p. 391.
5. Guillaume, *L'Internationale*, vol. 1, pp. 72–74.
6. *Ibid.*, pp. 74–75.
7. Becker Coll., f 4.
8. Letter by Gignoux, 12 May 1866, Vésinier Coll.
9. Becker Coll., D II 29.
10. The texts of the proposed program and statutes with Marx's comments, *GC.Min.*, vol. 3, pp. 273–278; the council's meeting, *ibid.*, pp. 53–56. The original French text of the answer, *GC.Min.*, vol. 3, pp. 299–301; the English translation, *ibid.*, pp. 387–389.
11. Becker Coll., D II 1347.
12. *L'Égalité*, 16 Dec. 1868. On Bakunin's contributions, *DMB*, p. 202.
13. *GC.Min.*, vol. 3, pp. 301–311.
14. Becker Coll., H 8.
15. The text of the revised program and statutes of the alliance, *EDS*, pp. 231–240.
16. *GC.Min.*, vol. 3, pp. 134–135.
17. "L'Alliance de la démocratie socialiste, procès-verbaux de la Section de Genève, 15 janvier 1869–23 décembre 1870," eds. Bert Andréas and Miklós Molnár, in *EDS*, pp. 205–206.
18. Max Nettlau's unpublished "Michael Bakunin; eine Biographie." typed transcript in IISG, pp. 247–249.
19. "L'Alliance," in *EDS*, p. 148.
20. Letter quoted in "L'Alliance," in *EDS*, pp. 219–220.
21. Arthur Lehning, "Bakunin's Conceptions of Revolutionary Organisations and Their Role; a Study of His Secret Societies," in *Essays in Honour of E. H. Carr*, ed. C. Abramsky, London, 1964, pp. 57–81. An interesting assessment of the personality of Bakunin and his activities and a critique of Lehning's views on Bakunin is contained in a monograph by Aileen Kelly, *Mikhail Bakunin; a Study in the Psychology and Politics of Utopianism*, Oxford, 1982.
22. *Michel Bakounine; de la guerre à la Commune de Paris*, ed. F. Rude, Paris, 1972, p. 431.

23. Letter to Talandier, 24 July 1870, in Guillaume's *L'Internationale*, vol. 2, pp. 59–64.

24. Details can be found in: Michael Prawdin, *The Unmentionable Nechaev: A Key to Bolshevism*, London, 1961; Michel Confino, *Violence dans la violence: le débat Bakounine-Nechaev*, Paris, 1973; Paul Avrich, *Bakunin and Nechaev*, London, 1974; Aileen Kelly, *ibid.*, pp. 257–288.

25. The proposal of a program for the congress in Basel and the following discussions in the meetings of the General Council, in *GC.Min.*, vol. 3, pp. 114, 116–123, 125–133, 137, 140–147.

26. List of delegates to the congress in Basel, *PI.Rec.*, vol. 2, pp. 8–12. The proceedings of the Basel congress are related mainly on the basis of a long and detailed report, published in Brussels after the conclusion of the congress (Imprimerie Desiré Brismée) and reproduced in *PI.Rec.*, vol. 2, pp. 5–131. I also used press reports, Guillaume's account of the congress in his *L'Internationale*, vol. 2, and other sources.

27. Letter dated 13 Nov. 1869, Marx-Engels Coll., D 3614.

28. Fribourg, *L'Association*, p. 140.

29. Wilhelm Liebknecht, *Briefwechsel mit deutschen Sozialdemokraten, 1862–1878*, ed. Georg Eckert, Assen, 1973, pp. 267–268.

30. James Guillaume, "Varlin conspirateur," *La Vie Ouvrière*, 5 May 1913, pp. 568–569.

31. Michail Bakunin, *Sozial-politischer Briefwechsel mit Alexander Iw. Herzen und Ogarjow*, ed. M. Dragomanow, Stuttgart, 1895, pp. 175–176.

32. *GC.Min.*, vol. 3, p. 198.

33. Full text in *ibid.*, pp. 399–407.

34. Perret's letter to Jung, dated 4 Jan. 1870, Jung Coll., f 887.

35. *L'Égalité*, 19 Feb. 1870, article entitled "Révolution." On Utin, see Martin A. Miller, *The Russian Revolutionary Émigrés, 1825–1870*, Baltimore, 1986, pp. 164–176.

36. Becker Coll., D II 29.

37. Article entitled "Summarische Antwort," in *Vorbote*, Nov. 1869. The same issue of *Vorbote* contains an antireligious satirical poem, "Ein frommer Wunsch."

38. *Briefe und Auszuege*, p. 12.

39. *L'Égalité*, 9 April 1870.

40. *L'Égalité*, 23 April 1870.

41. *GC.Min.*, vol. 3, pp. 256, 368.

42. Letter of 3 March 1870, Becker Coll., D II 534.

43. *GC.Min.*, vol. 3, pp. 219–220, 410–411.

44. Letter dated 29 April 1870, *MEW*, vol. 32, p. 489.

6. WAR AND REVOLUTION

1. *Troisième Procès*, pp. 104–106.

2. Published originally in *Réveil* of 12 July 1870; quoted in General Council's first address on the Franco-German War, *MEW*, vol. 17, p. 4; O. Testut's *L'Internationale*, Paris, 1871, pp. 279–284, contains a long list of the undersigned.

3. Letter dated 19 August 1870, to Marie Iatskevich, Descaves Coll.

4. Texts of the various resolutions in *Die Erste Internationale in Deutschland*, pp. 510–512, 517–520; the Braunschweig Committee's appeal and report of the meeting, *ibid.*, pp. 505–509.

5. Marx-Engels Coll., D 856.

6. Association Internationale des Travailleurs, *Protestation contre la guerre*, Brussels, 1870.

7. *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 5.

8. *GC.Min.*, vol. 4, pp. 30–32, 321–329.

9. Jung's letters to Becker of 24 Aug. and 11 Sept. 1870, Becker Coll., D II.

10. *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 59.

11. Becker Coll., D I 238.

12. *GC.Min.*, vol. 4, pp. 56–59.

13. *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 54.

14. Text of the address in *GC.Min.*, vol. 4, pp. 333–342.

15. *Les séances officielles de l'Internationale à Paris pendant le siège et pendant la Commune*, Paris, 1872, pp. 82–87.

16. *Papiers Chassin*, vol. 6, f 2 (Musée de l'Hotel de ville, Paris).

17. *Ibid.*, f 3.

18. Marx's letter to De Paepe, dated 14 Sep. 1870, *MEW*, vol. 33, pp. 146–148.

19. *Les séances*, p. 54.

20. J. Rougerie, "L'AIT et le mouvement ouvrier à Paris pendant les événements de 1870–71," in "1871," pp. 50–51.

21. *Les séances*, pp. 126–152.

22. Guillaume, "Varlin conspirateur," p. 584.

23. *Les séances*, p. 135.

24. *Procès-verbaux de la Commune de 1871*, eds. G. Bourgin and G. Henriot, vol. 1: *March-April 1871*, Paris, 1924, pp. 55–56.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 282–284.

26. *Procès-verbaux*, vol. 2, Paris, 1945, pp. 20–23, 33–37.

27. *Les séances*, pp. 189–194.

28. "Michel Bakounine sur la guerre franco-allemande et la révolution sociale en France, 1870–1871," vol. 6, *Archives Bakounine*, ed. A. Lehning, Leiden, 1977, pp. 105–131.

29. Becker Coll., D I 890.

30. Nettlau, *Biographie*, ch. 57.

31. Rude, *Michel Bakounine*, pp. 515–516.

32. *Archives Bakounine*, vol. 7, Leiden, 1981, contains its full text, an "Introduction" by the editor, A. Lehning, and various other related pieces.

33. *Ibid.*, pp. 327–328.

34. Rude, *Michel Bakounine*, pp. 504–505.

7. LONDON 1871

1. *GC.Min.*, vol. 4, pp. 160–162.

2. *Les séances*, pp. 59–60.

3. *Tagebuch der Pariser Kommune: Karl Marx u. Friedrich Engels*, ed.-in-chief Erich Kundel, Berlin, 1971, pp. 82–84.

4. *MEW*, vol. 33, pp. 216–217.

5. *Ibid.*, pp. 226–227.

6. Text of this address, in English, in *GC.Min.*, vol. 4, pp. 356–416; *MEW*, vol. 17, pp. 313–365, contains the German translation, originally published in *Volksstaat*, June–July 1871, and soon published as a separate brochure, but revised in 1891 by Engels; two earlier versions by the pen of Marx, *ibid.*, pp. 491–610.

7. *MEW*, vol. 17, pp. 367–368; *GC.Min.*, vol. 4, pp. 417–418; the text of the letter was included in the third address, *ibid.*, pp. 414–416.

8. Hales's letter to Marx, dated 30 May 1871, Marx-Engels Coll., D 2214.

9. L. Herbst, *Die Erste Internationale als Problem der deutschen Politik in der Reichsgründungszeit*, Goettingen, 1975, pp. 102–107.

10. Tibaldi's letter to the press, in Becker Coll., D III 11.

11. Jung Coll., f 1099.

12. German translation of this leaflet, *MEW*, vol. 17, pp. 383–387; the original, in English, was addressed to the central committee of the sections of the International in America.

13. Marx-Engels Coll., D 861.

14. *GC.Min.*, vol. 4, pp. 237, 256.

15. Letter undated, Jung Coll., f 236.

16. The two letters, both dated 4 July, Marx-Engels Coll., D 3246–3247.

17. *GC.Min.*, vol. 4, pp. 69–73.

18. *Ibid.*, pp. 194–199.

19. Marx-Engels Coll., D 2212–2223.

20. *GC.Min.*, vol. 4, pp. 276–277.

21. Guillaume, *L'Internationale*, vol. 2, pp. 157–158.

22. Marx-Engels Coll., D 2869.

23. *GC.Min.*, vol. 4, pp. 151–152.

24. *Ibid.*, pp. 244–245.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 313–320.

26. Marx's letters to Engels, 7 and 10 May 1870, *MEW*, vol. 32, pp. 498, 503.

27. Marx-Engels Coll., D 2332.

28. *GC.Min.*, vol. 4, pp. 269–271.

29. Although the conference was "private" and only the General Council had the authority to publish its resolutions, reports of the conference appeared in some organs of the British press, written mainly by Eccarius. He was also the author of the report in the New York journal, *The World*, entitled: "The International, Official Report of the London Conference." From unpublished sources a report was reconstructed, partly compiled, which is included in *PI. Rec.*, vol. 2, pp. 145–244. Interesting analyses of the program, composition, course, and resolutions of the conference are in M. Molnár's *Le déclin de la Première Internationale: La Conférence de Londres de 1871*, Geneva, 1963—this book contains some important annexes.

30. *GC.Min.*, vol. 4, pp. 272–274, 315–319.

31. This very long discussion, carried on during 21 and 22 September, is related in *PI.Rec.*, vol. 2, pp. 191–205. Engels's speech is summarized on the basis of his own handwritten text, translated from French into German, in *MEW*, vol. 17, pp. 416–417. This text is longer and more precise than the one in the report, *PI.Rec.*, vol. 2, pp. 197–198.

32. Lorenzo wrote about this meeting in his memoirs, *El proletariado militante, memorias de un Internacional*, and that fragment was included, in French translation, by Molnár in his *Le déclin de la Première Internationale, la Conférence de Londres de 1871*, Geneva, 1963, p. 234. Marx wrote about the meeting to Paul and Laura Lafargue in a letter dated 24 Nov. 1871, *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 342.

33. The text in *PI.Rec.*, vol. 2, pp. 241–242; also in *Archives Bakounine*, vol. 1, part 2, Leiden, 1963, pp. 355–356.

34. Molnár, *Le déclin*, p. 234.

35. The text, in German translation, in Marx's letter to the Lafargue couple, dated 24–25 Nov. 1871, *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 342.

36. *MEW*, vol. 17, pp. 418–426, contains all the texts of the London conference resolutions, after their publication in *Volksstaat*; the texts are compared with the circular of the General Council, in English, published in November 1871. *L'Égalité* of 21 October 1871 published a fuller text of the resolution on the Swiss conflict, reproduced, in German translation, in *MEW*, vol. 17, pp. 427–430.

8. THE "LATIN" REBELLION

1. S. Bernstein, "Die Erste Internationale und die Grossmaechte," *Zeitschrift fuer Geschichtswissenschaft*, No. 4, 1953, pp. 602–603.

2. A. Claris, *La proscription française en Suisse, 1871–72*, Geneva, 1872, p. 9.

3. *Briefe und Auszuege*, p. 48.

4. Marc Vuilleumier, *La Suisse*, in "1871," p. 287.

5. Claris, *ibid.*, p. 94.

6. *PI.Rec.*, vol. 2, pp. 260–261.

7. Text of the circular, *ibid.*, pp. 261–265.

8. It was published by the Imprimerie Coopérative in Geneva and it carried the subtitle: *Circulaire privée du Conseil Général de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs*; reprinted in *PI.Rec.*, vol. 2, pp. 266–298.

9. *GC.Min.*, vol. 5, pp. 119–120.

10. Jung Coll., f 938.

11. *Réponse de quelques Internationaux, membres de la Fédération Jurassienne, à la Circulaire privée du Conseil Général de Londres*, 1872, 45 pp.; reprinted in *PI.Rec.*, vol. 2, pp. 297–308.

12. *Ibid.*, pp. 311–315.

13. Guillaume, *L'Internationale*, vol. 2, pp. 157–158.

14. *Archives Bakounine*, vol. 2: *Michel Bakounine et les conflits dans l'Internationale*, 1872, ed. A. Lehning, Leiden, 1965, pp. 1–85.

15. *Archives Bakounine*, vol. 1, part 2: *La Première Internationale et le conflit avec Marx*, ed. A. Lehning, Leiden, 1963, p. 181.

16. Becker's address on the occasion of the admission of the Russian Section in Geneva into the International, printed in *Narodnoye Delo* of 15 April 1870, reprinted in *Archives Bakounine*, vol. 2, pp. 259–261.

17. Nettlau, *Biographie*, p. 616.

18. History of that section, in J. M. Meijer, *Knowledge and Revolution; Russian Colony in Zurich, 1870–1879*, Assen, 1955.

19. *Rapport du Comité Fédéral Romand*, Geneva, 1872.

20. *L'Égalité*, 8 July 1871.
21. *Ibid.*, 13 August 1872.
22. Guillaume, *L'Internationale*, vol. 2, pp. 299–300.
23. Nettlau, *Biographie*, p. 2774.
24. Max Nettlau, "Bakunin und die Internationale in Italien bis zum Herbst 1872," in *Archiv fuer die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung, 1912–13*, pp. 275–329.
25. *GC.Min.*, vol. 3, pp. 73–74.
26. Letter dated 28 July 1871, *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 664.
27. Letter dated 13 Nov. 1871, *ibid.*, 319–320.
28. R. Hostetter, *The Italian Socialist Movement; Origins, 1860–1882*, Princeton, 1958, pp. 216–217.
29. *MEW*, vol. 17, pp. 390–392.
30. *La théologie politique de Mazzini et L'Internationale, par M. Bakounine, membre de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs, Commission de propagande socialiste*, Impr. J. Guillaume fils, Neuchâtel, 1871.
31. According to Nettlau, *Bakunin*, p. 307.
32. *MEW*, vol. 17, pp. 472–473.
33. *MEW*, vol. 33, pp. 371–375.
34. The text of that letter, dated 5 April 1872, is reproduced in German translation in *MEW*, vol. 18, pp. 469–471.
35. *MEW*, vol. 33, pp. 426–427.
36. Guillaume, *L'Internationale*, vol. 2, pp. 286–287; Nettlau, *Bakunin*, p. 324.
37. Max Nettlau, *La Première Internationale en Espagne, 1868–1888*, ed. R. Lamberet, Dordrecht, 1969, pp. 52–60.
38. "On Morago's correspondence with the Alliance," in *EDS*, pp. 174–175.
39. F. Engels, Paul Lafargue, and Laura Lafargue, *Correspondance*, vol. 1, ed. E. Bottigelli, Paris, 1956, p. 9.
40. Becker Coll., D II 1173–1174.
41. Nettlau, *La Première*, p. 264.
42. *Ibid.*, pp. 78–80.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 84–103.
44. Josep Termes, *Anarquismo y sindicalismo en España; la Primera Internacional, 1864–1881*, Barcelona, 1972, pp. 115–120.
45. Nettlau, *ibid.*, p. 109.
46. *La Federación*, No. 1, 1 August 1869.
47. *Ibid.*, 15 May 1870.
48. *MEW*, vol. 17, pp. 287–290.
49. Nettlau, *La Première*, p. 92.
50. *Asociación Internacional de los Trabajadores; Organización social de las secciones obreras de la Federación Regional Española*, Barcelona, n.d. [1871], 86 pp.
51. Milnár, *Le déclin*, pp. 231–236.
52. *MEW*, vol. 17, p. 467.
53. *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 348.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 356.
55. *GC.Min.*, vol. 5, pp. 64–65.
56. Letter dated 2 October 1871 and sent from San Sebastian, in Engels and Lafargue, *Correspondance*, pp. 9–12.

57. *MEW*, vol. 33, pp. 426–427.
58. Guillaume, *L'Internationale*, vol. 2, pp. 291–292.
59. Nettlau, *La Première*, pp. 117–124.
60. *Federación*, 1 September 1872.
61. *MEW*, vol. 18, pp. 122–124.
62. Letter of the Portuguese Section to the General Council, of 10 March 1872, signed by França, the secretary for abroad, and by Tedeschi, *PI.Rec.*, vol. 3, pp. 398–400; França's report in a letter to Engels, dated 24 June 1872, *ibid.*, pp. 400–410.
63. Descaves Coll., Box Varlin (IISG).
64. B. Malon, *La troisième défaite du prolétariat français*, Neuchâtel, 1871.
65. Engels in a letter to Lafargue, dated 19 January 1872, *MEW*, vol. 33, pp. 382–383.
66. Guillaume, *ibid.*, p. 346.
67. *GC.Min.*, vol. 5, pp. 482–483.
68. *Liberté*, 31 December 1871.
69. *L'Internationale* (Brussels), 28 May 1871.
70. Wouters, *Documenten*, vol. 1, pp. 485–486; D.E. Devreese, "La proscription en Belgique," in "1871," pp. 253–271.
71. *Liberté*, 31 December 1871.
72. Guillaume, *ibid.*, pp. 258–259.
73. Nettlau, *Biographie*, note 2808.
74. Letter dated 8 April 1872; this is one of the twenty-four letters in the Marx-Engels Collection, in IISG, numbered D 2128–2151, written between 1869 and 1875.
75. *L'Internationale* (Brussels), 14 April 1872.
76. *Liberté*, 28 April and 5 May 1872.

9. THE NORTHERN BASTIONS

1. August Bebel, *Aus meinem Leben*, vol. 2, Berlin, 1964, pp. 191–194.
2. *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 467.
3. *Ibid.*, p. 462.
4. H. Steiner, *Die Arbeiterbewegung Oesterreichs, 1867–1889*, Vienna, pp. 35–75; J. Koralka, "The First International in the Austrian and Czech Lands," in *P.J.IIR*, pp. 219–230; T. Erenyi and J. Jemnitz, "La Première Internationale et la Hongrie," *ibid.*, pp. 375–385; Z. Solle, *Die I. Internationale und Oesterreich, Historica* (Prague), vol. 10, 1965, pp. 255–300.
5. Hess, *Briefwechsel*, pp. 587–588.
6. J. Koralka, *ibid.*, p. 224.
7. H.-N. Lahme, "Zur Vorgeschichte der daenischen IAA-Sektionen," *IRSH*, 1974, vol. 19, pp. 54–72; H.-N. Lahme, "Niels Lorents Petersen, eine Skizze seines Lebens in der Arbeiterbewegung," *IRSH*, vol. 2, 1984, pp. 172–214; Claus Larsen, "Louis Pio, Hintergrund und Entwicklung," *Årborg for Arbejder Bevaegelsens Historie*, No. 2, 1972.
8. Letter dated 7 March 1872, *MEW*, vol. 33, pp. 414–417.
9. Théo van Tijn, "Le mouvement ouvrier de l'AIT aux Pays Bas," *Cahiers de l'histoire*, No. 37, 1989, pp. 61–84.
10. Marx-Engels Coll., D 2124.

11. P. S. Foner, *History of the Labor Movement in the United States*, New York, 1947, pp. 412–413.
12. Letter dated 26 March 1870, Marx-Engels Coll., R 77.
13. S. Bernstein, *The First International in America*, New York, 1962, pp. 38–40.
14. Z. Solle, "Die tschechischen Sektionen der Ersten Internationale in den Vereinigten Staaten," *Historica* (Prague), 1964, pp. 101–134.
15. *GC.Min.*, vol. 4, pp. 146–148, 180.
16. Sorge's report to London of April 1871, Jung Coll., f 1010.
17. *Ibid.*, f 65.
18. E. T. Gargan, "The American Conservative Response," in "1871," pp. 240–249.
19. This is quoted in F. Engels, "Die Internationale in America," published in *Volksstaat*, 17 July 1872, reprinted *MEW*, vol. 18, p. 98.
20. *GC.Min.*, vol. 5, pp. 124, 126; *MEW*, *ibid.*, pp. 52–54.
21. *MEW*, *ibid.*, pp. 99–100.
22. Letter to W. Liebknecht, dated 27–28 May 1872, *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 475.
23. *GC.Min.*, vol. 5, p. 161.
24. Marx-Engels Coll., D 1952–1963.
25. *GC.Min.*, vol. 5, p. 88.
26. Letter dated 2 May 1872, Marx-Engels Coll., D 1177.
27. *GC.Min.*, vol. 5, pp. 163–167.
28. *Ibid.*, pp. 194–199, 297–300.
29. *Ibid.*, pp. 219–220.
30. *Ibid.*, pp. 221–224.
31. Meeting of 16 July 1872, *ibid.*, pp. 255–256.
32. Subcommittee meeting of 19 July, *ibid.*, pp. 307–310.
33. Henry Collins and Chimen Abramsky, *Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement Years of the First International*, London, 1965, pp. 255–259; Jung Coll., 156–157 (press cuttings).
34. *GC.Min.*, vol. 5, pp. 263–265.
35. *Ibid.*, pp. 267–277.
36. *Ibid.*, pp. 270–272.
37. Jung's speech to the congress of the British federation on 26 January 1873, *Eastern Post*, 1 February 1873 (cutting in Jung Coll., f 160).
38. *GC.Min.*, vol. 5, pp. 282–284; a clear and concise account of Jung's proposal, *Eastern Post*, 1 Feb. 1873 (cutting in Jung Coll., f 160).

10. THE FULFILLMENT

1. *GC.Min.*, vol. 5, p. 316; Engels's letter to Becker, dated 5 August 1872, *MEW*, vol. 33, pp. 512–514; Marx's letter to Kugelmann of 26 August 1872, *ibid.*, p. 521.
2. Letter to Sorge, 9 Nov. 1871, *ibid.*, p. 315; to De Paepe, 28 May 1872, *ibid.*, pp. 479–480.
3. Letter dated 28 May 1872, *ibid.*, p. 477.
4. Marx-Engels Coll., D 2140.
5. Letter dated 21 June 1872, *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 491.
6. Letter dated 2 July 1872, *ibid.*, p. 494.
7. Marx's letter to Danielson, 15 August 1872, *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 516; Lyubavin's letter to Marx, 8(20) August 1872 and Danielson's letter to Marx, 9(21) August; *The*

Hague Congress of the First International, September 2-7 1872, Reports and Letters, ed.-in-chief Irena Bach, Moscow, 1978, pp. 459-463 and 464-465.

8. Our account of the Hague congress is based on two reports by Sorge, edited and translated from German into English by Hans Gerth under the title: *The First International, Minutes of the Hague Congress of 1872, with Related Documents*, Madison, 1958. The volume also contains a report written by Maltman Barry, originally for the *London Standard*. One of Sorge's reports is contained in French translation in *PI.Rec.*, vol. 2, pp. 326-380. J. Guillaume gave his own account in his *L'Internationale*, vol. 2, pp. 319-356. The most comprehensive collection of materials and documents of the The Hague congress was published in Moscow, in 2 volumes, in several languages, under the general editorship of Irena Bach. The volumes in English are: *Volume 1, The Hague Congress of the First International, September 2-7, 1872, Minutes and Documents*, 1976. It contains minutes by Le Moussu, Sorge, and Zhukovski, papers of the commission to investigate the Alliance, and so on. *Volume 2, The Hague Congress of the International, September 2-7, 1872, Reports and Letters*, 1978. It contains articles by Barry, Eccarius, Becker, Engels, and others, and a mass of documents and correspondence, dating from before the congress and after it.

9. *MEW*, vol. 18, pp. 165-170.

10. Nettlau, *Biographie*, note 3275.

11. Jung Coll., f 160.

12. On the precongress campaign in Germany, *Die 1. Internationale*, pp. 636-638, 648-673.

13. Guillaume, *L'Internationale*, vol. 2, p. 325; Nettlau, *ibid.*, note 3261.

14. Ch. de Mazade, "Chronique de la quinzaine," in *Revue des Deux Mondes*, 1 October 1872, p. 510.

15. *The Hague Congress, Reports and Letters*, pp. 42-46.

16. *The Hague Congress, Minutes and Documents*, p. 109.

17. *The Hague Congress, Reports and Letters*, p. 37.

18. The English text of the report is reprinted from the *International Herald* in *The Hague Congress, Minutes and Documents*, pp. 211-219; in German, after *Volksstaat*, in *MEW*, vol. 18, pp. 127-137.

19. Guillaume, *L'Internationale*, vol. 2, p. 336.

20. *Ibid.*, p. 343.

21. *The Hague Congress, Minutes and Documents*, pp. 348-360.

22. *MEW*, vol. 18, pp. 159-161.

23. *PI.Rec.*, vol. 3, pp. 37-39.

24. *Ibid.*, pp. 3-10.

25. *Ibid.*, pp. 344-357; Josep Termes, *Anarquismo y sindicalismo en España, la Primera Internacional, 1864-1881*, Barcelona, 1972, pp. 150-170.

26. Jung Coll., f 125.

27. Nettlau, *La Première*, pp. 187-208; Termes, *ibid.*, pp. 171-228.

28. *Entre Marx et Bakounine, César De Paepe, Correspondence*, B. Dandois, ed., Paris, 1974, p. 96; *DMB*, pp. 437-438.

29. *PI.Rec.*, vol. 3, pp. 163-168.

30. *Ibid.*, p. 191.

31. *Procès de l'Internationale, compte-rendu des débats devant la Chambre de police correctionnelle de Toulouse*, Paris-Toulouse, 1873.

32. Letter dated 3 May 1873, *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 582.

33. *Internationale et revolution, à propos du Congrès de la Haye, par de réfugiés de la Commune, ex-membres du Conseil Général de l'Internationale*, London, 1872.

34. Eccarius Korrespondenz, 611 C, in Jung Collection, contains a letter by Eccarius to Jung, dated 10 June 1874, dealing with the break with Marx.

35. *PI.Rec.*, vol. 3, pp. 203–204, 536, note 560.

36. Jung Coll., f 162.

37. *Eastern Post*, 1 Feb. 1873, cutting in Jung Coll. f 160.

38. Letter to Bolte, 12 Feb. 1873, *MEW*, vol. 33, pp. 564–565.

39. *Ibid.*, p. 635.

40. Bernstein, *The First International in America*, pp. 162–163.

41. *The Hague Congress, Minutes and Documents*, pp. 220–223.

42. *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 573.

43. Engels to Sorge, 2 Nov. 1872, *ibid.*, pp. 535–536.

44. Jung Coll., f 135.

45. Jung Coll., f 129; *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 552.

46. Marx to Sorge, 3 May 1873, *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 582; Marx to Becker, 7 April 1873, *ibid.*, p. 579.

47. *The World*, 26 May 1873, cutting in Jung Coll., f 296.

48. *PI.Rec.*, vol. 4, pp. 163–247, contains a report of the proceedings of the congress, published in *The Times*, written probably by Eccarius, and some other reports and documents relating to the convocation, course, and repercussions of that congress.

49. *Ibid.*, p. 97.

50. J. Dhondt, *Un militant gantois de la Première Internationale, Contributions à l'histoire économique et sociale*, vol. 2, Brussels, 1963, p. 111.

51. Letter dated 22 Sept. 1873, *Briefe und Auszuege*, pp. 119–120.

52. Letter dated 27 Sept. 1873, *MEW*, vol. 33, pp. 605–607.

53. *PI.Rec.*, vol. 4, pp. 5–157, contains the text of the official report, printed by Guillaume in *Le Locle*; this is supplemented from manuscripts on which the printed text was based; other documents were added by the editors.

54. *MEW*, vol. 33, p. 641.

55. *PI.Rec.*, vol. 4, pp. 407–412.

56. Becker Coll., C 12.

Bibliography

Note: ed.(s.) means, normally, also the author(s) of the introduction and the notes; ed.(s.)-in-chief means, normally, also the coauthor(s) of the introduction and the notes.

ABBREVIATIONS

AGSA	Archiv fuer die Geschichte des Sozialismus und der Arbeiterbewegung.
AIT	Association internationale des travailleurs
BGDA	Beitraege zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung, Berlin
EDS	<i>Études et documents sur la Première Internationale en Suisse</i> , ed. Jacques Freymond, Geneva, 1963.
"1871"	"1871, Jalons pour une histoire de la Commune de Paris," ed.-in-chief Jacques Rougerie, <i>IRSH</i> , vol. 17, 1972.
IAA	Internationale Arbeiterassoziation
IISG	International Instituut voor Sociale Geschiedenis, Amsterdam
IMLB	Institut des Marxismus-Leninismus, Berlin
IMLM	Institut marksizma-leninizma (formerly: Institut Marksa, Engelsa, Lenina), Moscow.
IRSH	<i>International Review of Social History</i> , Amsterdam
IWK	<i>Internationale Wissenschaftliche Korrespondenz zur Geschichte der deutschen Arbeiterbewegung</i> , Berlin.
IWMA	International Working Men's Association
MS	Le Mouvement Social, Paris
PI.IIR	<i>La Première Internationale, l'institution, l'implantation, le rayonnement, Colloque International, 16-18 Septembre 1964</i> , ed.-in-chief Ernest Labrousse, Paris, 1968.

UNPUBLISHED SOURCES

Archives de la Préfecture de Police, Paris, Dossier de l'Internationale (a typed transcription of the contents of these archives was kindly lent to the author by the late Dr. Bert Andréas).

Becker Collection, IISG.

Czartoryski Archives, Cracow.

Descaves Collection, IISG.

Howell Collection, incl. Reform League Archives, Bishopsgate Institute, London.

Jung Collection, incl. Eccarius Korrespondenz and Belgische Federatie, IISG.

Kleine Korrespondenz, Deutsche Sozialisten, IISG.

Marx-Engels Collection, IISG.

Nettlau, Max, "Michael Bakunin, eine biographische Skizze mit Auszuegen seiner Schriften" (the author used the typed transcription of the manuscript which was kindly put at his disposal by the Section of Anarchism at the IISG in Amsterdam).

Papiers Chassin, Musée de l'Hotel de Ville, Paris.

Vésinier Collection, IISG.

CONTEMPORARY LITERATURE

Contained in this section are also memoirs, pamphlets, and historical outlines by contemporaries, written after the demise of the International.

Almanach du Peuple, vols. 1-4, St. Imier-Loche, 1871-1874.

André, L., Bakounine, M., Lefrançais, G., and Schwitzguébel, A. *Simple questions sociales*, St. Imier, 1871.

Anon., *Biographie des alten Veteran der Freiheit, Johann Philipp Becker*, Zurich, 1889.

Association internationale des travailleurs. *Protestation contre la guerre*, Brussels, 1870.

Association internationale des travailleurs, Section Liègeoise. *Appel aux ouvriers*, Liege, 1869.

Association internationale des travailleurs et la grève genèvoise, Geneva, 1868.

Becker, Bernhardt. *Der grosse Arbeiter-Agitator Ferdinand Lassalle; Denkschrift fuer die Todesfeier des Jahres 1865*, Berlin, 1865.

Becker, Johann Philipp. *Wie und Wann, ein ernstes Wort ueber die Fragen und Aufgaben der Zeit*, Geneva, 1862.

Becker, J.P. *Die Internationale Arbeiter-Association und die Arbeitseinstellung in Genf im Fruehjahr 1868*, Geneva, 1868.

Becker, J.P. *Die Internationale Arbeiter-Association und die Arbeiterbewegung in Basel im Winter 1868 auf 1869*, Geneva, 1869.

Beesly, Edward Spencer. "The International Working Men's Association," *Fortnightly Review*, London, November 1870.

Bertrand, Louis. *Souvenir d'un meneur socialiste*, vol. 1, Brussels, 1972.

Buerkli, Karl. *Direkte Gesetzgebung durch das Volk*, Zurich, 1869.

Claris, A. *La proscription française en Suisse, 1871-72*, Geneva, 1872.

De Paepe, César. *Vie d'un proletaire socialiste*, Gand, 1911.

- Domela, A. *Der Congress der Internationale in Haag von 2-7 September 1872, geschildert von einem hollaendischen Augenzeugen*, 1873.
- Eccarius, Georg J. *The Hours of Labour*. London, 1872.
- Eichhoff, Wilhelm. *Die Internationale Arbeiterassociation, ihre Gruendung, Organisation, politisch-soziale Taetigkeit und Ausbreitung*, Berlin, 1868.
- Faillet, E. *Biographie de Varlin*, Paris, n.d.
- Fribourg, E.E. *L'Association internationale des travailleurs*, Paris, 1871.
- "General and British Federative Rules of the IWMA," together with a "Report of the Second Annual Congress of the British Federation," Manchester, 1873.
- Guillaume, James. *Le collectivisme de l'Internationale*, Neuchâtel, 1904.
- Guillaume, James. *L'Internationale, documents et souvenirs, 1864-1878*, 4 vols., Paris, 1905-1910.
- Guillaume, James. "Varlin conspirateur," *Vie Ouvrière*, 5 May 1913.
- Guillaume, James. *Karl Marx pangermaniste et l'AIT*, Paris, 1915.
- Howell, George. "The History of the International Association," *The Nineteenth Century*, London, July-December 1878.
- Internationale Arbeiter-Association. *Verhandlungen der Delegierten-Konferenz zu Philadelphia, 15 July 1876*, New York, 1876.
- Internationale et révolution, à propos du Congrès de La Haye, par des réfugiés de la Commune, ex-membres du Conseil Général de l'Internationale*, London, 1872.
- Lefrançais, Gustave. *Souvenir d'un révolutionnaire*, Brussels, n.d.
- Lessner, Frederick. *Sixty Years in the Social-Democratic Movement*, London, 1907.
- Lissagaray, Prosper Oliver. *Histoire de la Commune de 1871*, Brussels, 1876.
- Ligue Internationale de la Paix et de la Liberté, *Annales du Congrès de Genève, 9-12 Septembre 1867*, Geneva, 1868.
- Longuet, Jean. *La politique internationale du marxisme, Karl Marx et la France*, Paris, 1918.
- Lorenzo, Anselmo. *El proletariado militante, memorias de un Internacional*, vol. 1, Barcelona, n.d. [1901]
- Malon, Benoît. *L'Internationale, son histoire et ses principes*, Neuchâtel, 1872.
- Manifeste du Groupe de propagande révolutionnaire verviétois*, Verviers, 1873.
- Mollin, Gabriel. *Rapport sur le Congrès de Bâle*, Paris, 1870.
- Monnier, M. *Genève et genevois en 1868*, *Revue des Deux Mondes*, Paris, 15 Dec. 1868.
- Mora, Francisco. *Historia del socialismo obrero español*, Madrid, 1902.
- Le Peuple, Association de la démocratie militante*, Brussels, n.d.
- Procès de l'Association internationale des travailleurs, Bureau de Paris*, Paris, 1868.
- Procès de l'Association internationale des travailleurs: Première et deuxième commissions du Bureau de Paris*, Paris, 1870.
- Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph. *De la capacité politique des classes ouvrières*, Paris, 1865.
- Rapport du Comité Fédéral Romand*, Geneva, 1872.
- Réponse de quelques Internationaux, membres de la Fédération Jurassienne à la Circulaire privée du Conseil Général à Londres*, 1872.
- Les Séances officielles de l'Internationale à Paris pendant le siège et pendant la Commune*, Paris, 1872.
- Testut, Oscar. *L'Internationale*, Paris, 1871.

- Testut, Oscar. *L'Internationale et le jacobinisme au ban de l'Europe*, vols. 1–2. Paris, 1872.
- Tolain, Henri. *Quelques vérités sur les élections de Paris*, Paris, 1863.
- Troisième procès de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs à Paris*, Paris, 1870.

Contemporary Press

- Bee-Hive* (referred to as the *Beehive*), London, 1863–1872.
- Commonwealth*, London, 1866–1867.
- Le Courier International*, London, 1864–1867 (French mutation of *International Courier*).
- The Eastern Post*, London, 1870–1873.
- L'Égalité*, Journal de l'AIT de la Suisse Romande, Geneva, 1868–1872.
- La Emancipación*, Madrid, 1871–1873.
- L'Espiègle*, Journal satirique, politique, artistique et littéraire, Brussels, 1865–1869.
- La Federación*, Órgano del Centro Federal de las Sociedades Obreras, Barcelona, 1869–1873.
- Glos Wolny*, London, 1865.
- The International Courier*, London, 1864–1867 (the English mutation of *International Courier*).
- The International Herald*, London, 1872–1873.
- L'Internationale*, Organe des sections belges de l'AIT, Brussels, 1869–1872.
- La Liberté*, Politique, économie sociale, science, littérature, beaux arts, Brussels, 1867–1872.
- Le Marseillaise*, Paris, 1870.
- Pall Mall Gazette*, London, 1863–1872.
- La Révolution Sociale*, Geneva, 1871–1872.
- Reynold's Newspaper*, London, 1863–1872.
- La Rive Gauche*, Paris-Brussels, 1865–1866.
- Der Social-Demokrat*, Berlin, 1864–1871.
- La Tribune du Peuple*, Brussels, 1863–1869.
- La Voix de l'Avenir*, Moniteur des sciences, du travail, des sociétés et des associations ouvrières, Chaux-de-Fonds, 1865–1868.
- Volksstaat*, Organ der Social-Demokratischen Arbeiterpartei und internationalen Gewerksgenossenschaften, Leipzig, 1869–1872.
- Vorbote*, Politische und social-oekonomische Zeitschrift [followed by other subtitles], Geneva, 1866–1871.
- Workman's Advocate*, London, 1865–1866.

PUBLISHED SOURCES

- Actas de los Consejos y Omisión Federal de la Región Española, 1870–1874*, vols. 1–2, Barcelona, 1969.
- “L'Alliance de la démocratie socialiste, procès-verbaux de la Section de Genève, 15 janvier 1869–23 décembre, 1870, eds. Bert Andréas and Miklós Molnár, in *EDS*.

Archives Bakounine, ed. Arthur Lehning (IISG):

Vol. 1, Part 1, *Michel Bakounine et l'Italie*, Leiden, 1961;

Vol. 1, Part 2, *La Première Internationale en Italie et le conflit avec Marx*, Leiden, 1963.

Vol. 2, part 2, *La Première Internationale et le conflit avec Marx*, Leiden, 1963.

Vol. 2, *Michel Bakounine et les conflits dans l'Internationale, 1872, la question germano-slave, le communisme d'état*, Leiden, 1965;

Vol. 3, *Étatisme et anarchie*, 1873, Leiden, 1967;

Vol. 4, *Michel Bakounine et ses relations avec Ségej Necaev, 1870–1872*, Leiden, 1971;

Vol. 5, *Michel Bakounine et ses relations slaves, 1870–1873*, Leiden, 1974;

Vol. 6, *Michel Bakounine sur la guerre franco-allemande et la révolution sociale en France, 1870–1871*, Leiden, 1977;

Vol. 7, *Michel Bakounine, L'Empire knouto-germanique et la révolution sociale. 1870–1871*, Leiden, 1981.

Bakounine, M. *Oeuvres*, vols. 1–6, Paris, 1895–1913.

Bakounine, M. *De la guerre à la Commune*, ed. Ferdinand Rude, Paris, 1972.

Bakunin, M. *Sozial-politischer Briefwechsel mit Alexander Iw. Herzen und Ogarjow*, ed. M. Dragomanow, Stuttgart, 1895.

Bakunin, M. *Gesammelte Werke*, vols. 1–3, Berlin, 1921–1924.

Bebel, August. *Reden und Schriften*, vol. 1: 1863–1878, eds. Rolf Dlubek and Ursula Herrmann, Berlin, 1970.

Becker, J.P., Dietzgen, J., Engels, F., Marx, K., et al. *Briefe und Auszüge aus Briefen an F.A. Sorge und Andere*, Stuttgart, 1906.

"Conversations between Lord Odo Russel and Andrassy, Bismarck and Gorchakov in September 1872," in *Unprinted Documents*, ed. W. Taffs, *Slavonic Review*, vol. 8, 1930.

Der Leipziger Hochverratsprozess vom Jahre 1872, ed. K.-M. Leidigkeit, Berlin, 1960.

Documenten betreffende de geschiedenis der arbeidersbeweging, 1853–1865, ed. Hubert Wouters, Louvain-Paris, 1966.

Documenten betreffende de geschiedenis der arbeidersbeweging ten tijde van de Ie Internationale, 1866–1880, vols. 1–2 of 3, ed. Hubert Wouters, Louvain-Paris, 1970–1971.

Documents relatifs à l'histoire de la Première Internationale en Wallonie, ed. C. Oukhow, Louvain-Paris, 1967.

Documents relatifs aux militants belges de l'Association internationale des travailleurs. Correspondance, 1865–1872, ed. Daisy Eveline Devreese, Louvain-Brussels, 1986.

Engels, Friedrich, Lafargue, Paul, and Lafargue, Laura. *Correspondance*, vol. 1: 1868–1886, ed. E. Bottigelli, Paris, 1956.

Entre Marx et Bakounine, César De Paepe, Correspondance, ed. B. Dandois, Paris, 1974.

Die Erste Internationale in Deutschland, 1864–1872, Dokumente und Materialien, eds.-in-chief Rolf Dlubek and Evgenija Stepanova, Berlin, 1964.

The First International, Minutes of the Hague Congress of 1872, with Related Documents, ed. Hans Gerth, Madison, 1958.

- Founding of the First International, a Documentary Record*, Moscow, 1935.
- The General Council of the First International, Minutes 1864–1872*, vols. 1–5, IMLM, Moscow, n.d. [1960s].
- The Hague Congress of the First International, September 2–7 1872*, vols. 1–2, ed.-in-chief Irena Bach; vol. 1: *Minutes and Documents*, vol. 2: *Reports and Letters*, IMLM, Moscow, 1976–1978.
- Herzen, A., Ogarev, N., and Bakounine M. *Lettres inédites*, ed. M. Mervaud, Paris, 1975.
- Hess, Moses. *Briefwechsel*, ed. E. Silberner, The Hague, 1959.
- Lettres de B. Malon à C. De Paepe, *Revue Socialiste*, No. 286, October 1908.
- Lettres de C. De Paepe à B. Malon, *Revue Socialiste*, No. 341, May 1913.
- "Lettres d'Eugène Varlin à Albert Richard," ed. E. Dolleans, *IRSH*, vol. 2, 1937.
- Liebknecht, Wilhelm. *Briefwechsel mit Karl Marx und Friedrich Engels*, ed. G. Eckert, The Hague, 1963.
- Liebknecht, Wilhelm. *Briefwechsel mit deutschen Sozialdemokraten, 1862–1878*, ed. G. Eckert, Assen, 1973.
- Marx, Karl, and Engels, Friedrich. *Werke*, vols. 15–19, *Writings 1860–1883*, vols. 30–35, *Letters, 1860–1883*, eds. IMLM, Berlin, 1964–1969. *Papers of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association*, New York, 1872–1876, ed. S. Bernstein, Annali, 1961.
- La Première Internationale, Recueil de documents*, ed.-in-chief Jacques Freymond; vols. 1–2, 1864–1872, eds. H. Burgelin, K. Langfeldt, and M. Molnár, Geneva, 1962; vols. 3–4, 1872–1877, eds. B. Andrés and M. Molnár, Geneva, 1871.
- Procès des Communards*, ed. J. Rougerie, Paris, 1969.
- Procès-verbaux de la Commune de 1871*, eds. G. Bourgin and G. Henriot; vol. 1: *March–April 1871*, Paris, 1924; vol. 2: *May 1871*, Paris, 1945.
- Tagebuch der Pariser Kommune, Karl Marx u. Friedrich Engels*, ed.-in-chief Erich Kundel, IMLB, Berlin, 1971.
- Unveroeffentliche Bracke-Briefe, aus den Anfaengen der Braunschweiger Arbeiterbewegung*, ed. G. Eckert, Braunschweig, 1955.
- Vingt lettres sur l'Association internationale des travailleurs en Belgique, 1865–1872*, ed. B. Dandois, MS, No. 62, Jan.–March 1968.

REFERENCE WORKS

- Biografish voordoenboek van het socialisme en de arbeidersbeweging in Nederland*, eds. P.J. Maertens et. al., 2 vols., Amsterdam, 1987.
- Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier français*, ed.-in-chief Jean Maitron, deuxième période: *la Première Internationale et la Commune*, vols. 4–9, Paris, 1964–1971.
- Dictionnaire biographique du mouvement ouvrier international*, vol. 1: *Autriche*, eds. Jean Maitron and Georges Haupt, Paris, 1971.
- Karl Marx, *Chronik seines Lebens in Einzeldaten*, IMLM, Moscow, 1934.
- La Première Internationale, registers*, vol. 1: *Périodiques, 1864–1877*, Paris, 1958, vol. 2: *Imprimés, 1864–1876, actes officiels du Conseil Général et des*

congrès et conférences de l'AIT, Paris, 1961; vol. 3: Imprimés, 1864–1876, actes officiels des fédérations et sections nationales de l'AIT, Paris, 1963.

Rubel, M., *Chronologie, Karl Marx et la Première Internationale, Cahiers de l'ISEA*, No. 152, August, 1964.

GENERAL WORKS, MONOGRAPHS, CONTRIBUTIONS

Aranyossi, M. *Leo Frankel*, Berlin, 1957.

Archer, J.P.W., "The Crowd in Lyon Commune," in "1871."

Armstrong, S.W. "The Internationalism of the Early Social-Democrats of Germany," *American Historical Review*, vol. 47, 1942.

L'Association Internationale des Travailleurs (Special Number), ed. Michel Cordilliot, *Cahiers d'Histoire de l'Institut de Recherches Marxistes*, No. 37, Paris, 1989.

Avrich, Paul. *Bakunin and Nechaev*, London, 1987.

Babel, Antony. "La Première Internationale, ses débuts et son activité à Genève, 1864–1870," in *Mélanges d'études économiques et sociales*, offerts à William E. Rappard, Geneva, 1944.

Bergmann, Karl Hans. *Blanqui, ein Rebell im 19. Jahrhundert*, Frankfurt, 1986.

Bernstein, Eduard. *Die Geschichte der Berliner Arbeiterbewegung*, vol. 1, Berlin, 1907.

Bernstein, Samuel. "Die Erste Internationale und die Grossmächte," *Zeitschrift fuer Geschichtswissenschaft*, No. 4, 1953.

Bertrand, Louis. *Histoire de la démocratie et du socialisme en Belgique depuis 1830*, vols. 1–2, Brussels-Paris, 1906–1907.

Bertrand, Louis. *César De Paepe, sa vie, son oeuvre*, Brussels, 1909.

Bigler, R.R. *Der libertäre Sozialismus in der Welschschweiz*, Cologne, 1963.

Bobinska, Celina. *Marks i Engels a sprawy polskie*, Warsaw, 1955.

Bourgin, G. "La lutte du gouvernement français contre la Première Internationale," *IRSH*, vol. 4, 1939.

Bourgin, G. *La Commune*, Paris, 1953.

Braunthal, Julius. *Geschichte der Ersten Internationale*, Hanover, 1961.

Brupbacher, F. *Marx und Bakunin*, Munich, 1913.

Carr, E.H. *Michel Bakunin*, London, 1937.

Carr, E.H. "The League of Peace and Freedom," *International Affairs*, vol. 14, 1935.

Cole, G.D.H. *Marxism and Anarchism*, vol. 2 of *A History of Socialist Thought*, London, 1957.

Collin-Dajch, H. "Contribution à l'étude de la Première Internationale à Bruxelles, 1865–1873," in *Cahiers Bruxellois*, vol. 1, 1956.

Collins, Henry, and Abramsky, Chimen. *Karl Marx and the British Labour Movement, Years of the First International*, London, 1965.

Confino, Michel. *Violence dans la violence, le débat Bakounine–Nechaev*, Paris, 1973.

Conti, Elio. *Le origini del Socialismo a Firenze, 1860–1880*, Rome, 1950.

Cordillot, Michel. "La naissance du mouvement ouvrier à Besançon. la Première Internationale, 1869–1873," *Cahiers du CIRA*, No. 1, Marseilles, 1986.

- Cordillot, Michel. *Les blanquistes à New York, 1871-1880*, Révolutions et mutations au 19^e siècle, No. 6, Paris, 1990.
- Dada, Adriana. *L'Anarchismo in Italia, fra movimento a partito, Storia et documenti dell'anarchismo italiano*, Milan, 1984.
- Dandois, B. *Dix ans d'histoire sociale en Belgique, 1860-1869*, MS, April-June 1870.
- Demarco, D. "La fondation de la Première Internationale à Naples. 1869-1870," in *PI.IIR*.
- Devreese, Daisy E. "La proscription en Belgique," in "1871."
- Devreese, Daisy, E. *Een onderzoek naar beïnvloeding en reacties, het voorbeeld van militanten van de arbeidersbeweging, België, 1830-1884*, Medelingen van de Nederlandse Vereniging tot beoefening van de sociale geschiedenis, No. 45, 1974.
- Devreese, Daisy E. "Vestiging van het IWB in België, 1865-1868," *Tijdschrift voor sociale geschiedenis*, No. 4, Feb. 1976.
- Dhondt, J. *Un militant gantois de la Première Internationale. Contributions à l'histoire économique et sociale*, Brussels, vol. 2, 1963.
- Dlubek, Rolf. *Johann Philipp Becker*, vols. 1-2, Leipzig, 1964.
- Dolléans, E. *Pierre-Joseph Proudhon*, Paris, 1950.
- Dolléans, E. *Eugène Varlin*, Paris, n.d.
- Dominick, Raymond H. *Wilhelm Liebknecht and the Founding of the German Social-Democratic Party*, Carolina, 1982.
- Dommanget, Maurice. *Edouard Vaillant*, Paris, 1956.
- Dommanget, Maurice. *Les idées politiques et sociale d'Auguste Blanqui*, Paris, 1957.
- Dommanget, Maurice. *Blanqui et l'opposition révolutionnaire à la fin du Second Empire*, Paris, 1960.
- Dommanget, Maurice. "Les blanquistes dans l'Internationale, de la chute de la Commune à la Conférence de Londres," in *PI.IIR*.
- Eckert, G. "Zur Geschichte der Braunschweiger Sektion der I. International," in *Braunschweigisches Jahrbuch*, 1962.
- Enckell, M. *La Fédération Jurassienne*, Lausanne, 1971.
- Erenyi, T., and Jemnitz, J. "La Première Internationale et la Hongrie," in *PI.IIR*.
- Foner, Philip S. *History of the Labor Movement in the United States*, New York, 1947.
- Frederici, Hans Juergen. *Ferdinand Lassalle, eine politische Biographie*, Berlin, 1985.
- Gargan, E.T.. "American Conservative Response," in "1871."
- Gemkow, E. *Zur Taetigkeit der Berliner Sektion der I. Internationale*, BGDA, 1959.
- Giele, J. J. *De Erste Internationale in Nederland*, Nijmegen, 1973.
- Grajewska, Irena. *Komuna Paryska*, Warsaw, 1971.
- Gruner, Ernst. *Die Arbeiter in der Schweiz im 19 Jahrhundert*, Bern, 1968.
- Haeberli, Wilfried. "Die Internationale Arbeiter-Assoziation in Basel, 1866-1871," in *EDS*.
- Harrison, Royden. "British Labour and the Confederacy," *IRSH*, vol. 2, 1957.
- Harrison, Royden. *Before the Socialists, Studies in Labour and Politics, 1861-1881*, London, 1965.
- Haupt, Georges. *Notes sur les archives de la Première Internationale, réunis par le BSI*, MS, No. 44, 1963.
- Herbst, Ludolf. *Die Erste Internationale als Problem der deutschen Politik in der Reichsgruendungszeit*, Goettingen, 1975.

- Hostetter, Richard. *The Italian Socialist Movement*, vol. 1, Princeton, 1958.
- Humbert-Droz, Jules. "Les débuts de l'AIT dans le Jura," in *EDS*.
- Humphrey, A.W. *Robert Applegarth*, London, 1913.
- Hutton, Patrick H. *The Cult of the Revolutionary Tradition, the Blanquists in French Politics, 1864-1893*, Los Angeles, 1981.
- Itenberg, B. "La Première Internationale et le mouvement révolutionnaire en Russie," in *PI.IIR*.
- Jaekkh, Gustav. *Die Internationale*, Leipzig, 1904.
- Jellinek, F. *The Paris Commune of 1871*, London, 1937.
- Johansen, B. L. *Louis Pio, Årbog for Arbejder-Bevaegelsens*, vol. 2, Copenhagen, 1972.
- Johnpoll, Bernard K., with Lilian Johnpoll, *The Impossible Dream: The Rise and Demise of the American Left*, Westport, Conn., 1981.
- Joll, James. *The Anarchists*, London, 1964.
- Judt, Tony. *Marxism and the French Left, Studies in Labour and Politics in France, 1830-1981*, Oxford, 1986.
- Kaplan, Temma. *Anarchists of Andalusia, 1868-1903*, Princeton, 1977.
- Katz, Henryk. *Liga Reformy, studium politycznej organizacji robotniczej w sredniowiktorianskiej Anglii*, Lodz, 1962.
- Katz, Henryk. *Die englische Arbeiter, der polnische nationale Aufstand und die Entstehung der Ersten Internationale*, BGDA, No. 5, 1966.
- Kelly, Aileen. *Mikhail Bakunin: A Study in the Psychology and Politics of Utopianism*, Oxford, 1982.
- Kirk, Neville. *The Growth of Working-Class Reformism in Mid-Victorian England*, London, 1985.
- Knizhnik, Vyetrov I.S. *Russkiye dyeyateli Piervogo Internatsyionala i Paryzhskoy Komuny*, Moscow-Leningrad, 1964.
- Koralka, J. "The First International in Austrian and Czech Lands," in *PI.IIR*.
- Kozmin, B. P. *Russkaya Sektsiya Pyervogo Internatsionala*, Moscow, 1957.
- Kropotkin, P. *Memoirs of a Revolutionist*, chs. 8-9, New York, 1962.
- Lahme, Hans-Norbert. "Zur Vorgeschichte der daenischen IWW-Sektionen," *IRSH*, vol. 19, No. 1, 1974.
- Langkau, G. "Die deutsche Sektion in Paris," in "1871."
- Lasserre, André. "La Première Internationale dans le canton de Vaud," in *EDS*.
- Lasserre, André. *Vuilleumier Marc. Centenaire du Congrès de Lausanne, 1867-1967*, Lausanne, 1967.
- Lehning, Arthur. "Bakunin's Conceptions of Revolutionary Organisations and Their Role: A Study of His Secret Societies," in *Essays in Honour of E.H. Carr*, ed. C. Abramsky, London, 1964.
- Lehning, Arthur. "La lutte des tendances au sein de la Première Internationale; Marx et Bakounine," in *PI.IIR*.
- Lehning, Arthur. *From Buonarroti to Bakunin, Studies in International Socialism*. Leiden, 1970.
- McClennan, W.D. *Marxist or Populist, the Russian Section of the First International*, Cahiers de l'ISEA (Paris), Aug. 1964.
- Machl, W.H. *Behel and the Revolutionary Solution of the German Problem, 1866-1871*, IWK, No. 3, 1974.

- Maitron, Jean. "Les effectifs de la Première Internationale en France," in *PI.IIR*.
- Maluquer de Motes, Bernet Jordi. *El socialismo en España, 1833-1868*, Barcelona, 1977.
- Marti, Casimiro. *Origenes del anarquismo en Barcelona*, Barcelona, 1959.
- Mattmueller, M. *Pierre Coullery und die Anfaenge der Arbeiterbewegung im Kanton Bern*, Basel, 1968.
- Mayer, Gustav. *Friedrich Engels, a Biography*, London, 1936.
- Mehring, Franz. *Karl Marx, Geschichte seines Lebens*, Leipzig, 1933.
- Mehring, Franz. *Geschichte der deutschen Sozialdemokratie*, Berlin, 1960.
- Meijer, J.M. *Knowledge and Revolution; Russian Colony in Zurich, 1870-1879*, Assen, 1955.
- Miller, Martin A., *The Russian Revolutionary Émigrés, 1825-1870*, Baltimore, 1986.
- Moissonier, M. *La Première Internationale et la Commune à Lyon*, Paris, 1972.
- Molnár, Miklós. *Le declin de la Première Internationale, la Conférence de Londres de 1871*, Geneva, 1963.
- Morgan, Roger. *The German Social Democrats and the First International, 1864-1872*, Cambridge, 1965.
- Nettlau, Max. *Bakunin und die Internationale in Italien, bis zum Herbst 1872*, in AGSA, 1912-1913.
- Nettlau, Max. *Zur Geschichte der spanischen Internationale und Landesfederation, 1868-1889*, in AGSA, 1929.
- Nettlau, Max. *La Première Internationale en Espagne, 1868-1888*, ed. R. Lamberet, Dordrecht, 1969.
- Perrier, Hubert. "Du socialisme au 'syndicalisme pur et simple,' l'influence de la Première Internationale sur le mouvement americain," *Cahiers d'Encrages*, May 1988.
- Piccone, Paul. *Italian Marxism*, Berkeley, Calif., 1983.
- Ponsot, P. *Les grèves de 1870 et la Commune de 1871 au Creusot*, Paris, 1957.
- Postgate, R.W. *The Workers International*, London-New York, 1920.
- Préau, M. "La Ligue de la Paix et de la Liberté, le premier congrès, Genève, 1867," *Revue des Sciences Politiques* (Paris), vol. 28, 1912.
- La Première Internationale, L'institution, l'implantation, le rayonnement, Colloque international, 16-18 Septembre 1964*, ed. Ernest Labrousse, Paris, 1968.
- Puech, J. L., *Le proudhonisme dans l'AIT*, Paris, 1907.
- Puissant, Jean. *L'évolution du mouvement ouvrier socialiste dans le Borinage*, Brussels, n.d. [1982].
- Pyerviy Internatsional*, vols. 1-2, eds. I.A. Bach, L.I. Golman, and B.E. Kunina, Moscow, 1957.
- Rjasanoff, D. "Die Entstehung der Internationalen Arbeiter-Assoziation, zur Geschichte der Ersten Internationale," in *Marx-Engels Archiv*, vol. 1, Frankfurt a.M., 1925.
- Romano, A. *Storia del movimento socialista in Italia*, vol. 1: *l'Unità Italiana e la Prima Internazionale, 1861-1871*, Bari-Laterza, 1966.
- Romano, A. "Origines de la Première Internationale en Italie," in *PI.IIR*.
- Rothstein, Theodor. *Aus der Vorgeschichte der Internationale*, Stuttgart, 1913.
- Rougerie, Jacques. *La Première Internationale à Lyon, 1865-1870*, *Annali del Istituto Giangiacomo Feltrinelli*, vol. 4, 1961.

- Rougerie, Jacques. "Les sections françaises de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs," in *PI.IIR*.
- Rougerie, Jacques. *Composition d'une population insurgée, la Commune*, MS, No. 48, 1964.
- Rougerie, Jacques. "L'AIT et le mouvement ouvrier à Paris pendant les événements de 1870-1871," in "1871."
- Rubel, M. *Karl Marx, essai de biographie intellectuelle*, Paris, 1957.
- Schlueter, H. *Die Internationale in Amerika*, Chicago, 1918.
- Scirocco, Alfonso. *Democrazia e socialismo a Napoli, 1860-1878*, Naples, 1973.
- Serrano, C.S., "L'Espagne, la Commune et l'Internationale," in "1871."
- Silberner, E. *Moses Hess, Geschichte seines Lebens*, Leiden, 1962.
- Silberner, E. *Moses Hess und die Internationale Arbeiterassoziation*, Archiv fuer Sozialgeschichte, vol. 5, 1965.
- Solle, Z. *Die 1. Internationale und Oesterreich, Historica* (Prague), vol. 10, 1965.
- Steiner, Herbert. *Die Internationale Arbeiterassoziation und die oesterreichische Arbeiterbewegung*, Archiv fuer Sozialgeschichte, vol. 4, 1964.
- Steiner, Herbert. *Die Arbeiterbewegung Oesterreichs, 1867-1889*, Vienna.
- Steklov, G.M. *Die bakuninistische Internationale nach dem Haager Kongress, 1871-1881*, Stuttgart, 1914.
- Steklov, G.M. *History of the First International*, London, 1928.
- Ternes, Josep. *Anarquismo y sindicalismo en España, la Primera Internacional, 1864-1881*, Barcelona, 1972.
- Tombs, Robert. *The War against Paris*, Cambridge-London, 1981.
- Vuilleumier, Marc. "Les proscrits de la Commune en Paris," *Revue Suisse d'Histoire*, vol. 2, 1962.
- Vuilleumier, Marc. *Bakounine, l'Alliance de la démocratie socialiste et la Première Internationale à Genève, 1868-1869*, Cahiers Vilfredo Pareto, No. 4, 1964.
- Vuilleumier, Marc. *Notes sur James Guillaume, historien de la Première Internationale et ses rapports avec Max Nettlau et Jean Jaurès*, Cahiers Vilfredo Pareto, No. 7-8, 1965.
- Vuilleumier, Marc. *Les horlogers de l'anarchisme, l'émergence de la Fédération Jurassienne*, Lausanne, 1988.
- Weill, Georges. *Histoire du parti républicain en France, 1814-1870*, Paris, 1900.
- Weill, Georges. *Histoire du mouvement social en France, 1852-1902*, Paris, 1904.
- Wiss-Belleville, Elfriede. *Pierre Coullery und die Anfaenge der Arbeiterbewegung in Bern und der Westschweiz, ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des schweizerischen Fruehsozialismus*, Basel-Frankfurt a.M., 1987.

Index

- ADAV, *see* General German Workers League
- Alerini, 111, 131, 137
- Algiers section, 24
- Alianza de la Democracia Socialista (Spain), 104, 105–12, 134
- Alliance de la démocratie socialiste, 56
- Alliance of Socialist Democracy, *see* Alianza de la Democracia Socialista (Spain), 106
- Amalgamated Engineers Society, 25
- Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners, 3
- American Civil War, 3, 119
- Amsterdam section, 118, 138
- An-Archism, 8, 52
- anarchism, revolutionary, 52
- Ansell, 38
- anti-Semitism and anti-Marxism, 99
- Antonio y Anglosa ("Sarro Magallan"), 36, 105
- Antwerp, Volksverband in, 26
- Applegarth, Robert, 3, 41, 50, 60
- Arnaud, 125, 130, 133
- Association du sou pour l'affranchissement de la pensée eu de l'individu, 36, 38
- Association of German Workers Societies (Verband Deutscher Arbeitervereine, VDAV), 28, 29, 30; congress [Eisenach (1869), 42–44, 57, 60, 68, 117; Nuremberg (1868), 29–30, 44]; and IWMA, 30
- Associazione di Mutuo Progresso, 6
- Aubry, Hector, 10, 23, 36, 38, 46, 75, 76, 112
- Austria-Hungary, 116; IWMA in, 116–17
- Aviolat, Marc, 32
- Babeuf, François, 61, 62
- Babouvist, 63
- Bachmann, 43
- Bachruch, Henry, 117
- Bakunin, Nikolai, 39, 40, 51–68, 79, 86, 88, 92, 93, 97–101, 103, 105, 106, 110, 118, 129, 134–37; and abolition of rights of inheritance, 62; and Basel IWMA congress, 61–62; vs. Becker, 66; expulsion of from IWMA, 134–36;

- vs. General Council (London), 64–65;
in Geneva, 53–58; in Italy, 52; and
IWMA, 51–68; and L'Alliance
internationale de la démocratie
socialiste, 53; and League of Peace
and Freedom, 53; in Locarno, 80; and
Marx, 51–52, 65–66, 99–100, 108; and
Nechaev, 57–59, 64; and Robin, 64
- Bakuninists, 91, 93, 107, 112, 138
- banking, reform, 33, 37–38, 42, 108, 121
- Barcelona: section, 106; workers'
congress [1868, 105; 1870, 106–8]
- Barry, Maltman, 98, 122–24, 126, 127,
129, 130, 132–34, 139
- Basel: Fourth IWMA congress (1869),
46, 50, 59–64, 101, 106, 117, 119;
section, 36, 49
- Bastélica, 46, 64, 86, 89, 90, 91, 94, 95
- Bastin, 60
- Bazain, Marshall, 74
- Beales, Edmond, 5, 31
- Bebel, Auguste, 26, 29, 44, 70, 71, 91,
115, 116, 140
- Becker, Bernhard, 26, 28, 29, 30, 130
- Becker, Johann Philipp, 1, 11, 15, 18, 31,
32, 34–37, 40, 43, 44, 54–57, 61–63,
66, 67, 71, 80, 96, 97, 100, 106, 116–
18, 128, 131, 135, 136, 142–44
- Beehive, 2, 3, 5, 6, 22, 23, 42
- Beesly, Edward Spencer, 3, 5, 84
- Belgian federation, 113; congress,
Brussels [(1871), 113; (1872), 114,
138]
- Belgian sections, 47
- Belgium, 118; Communard refugees in,
113; IWMA in, 44, 47–49, 113–14,
138 [foundation, 10, 12–14; growth,
26–27]
- Berlin section, 70, 116
- Bern, second congress of Peace and
Freedom (1868), 37, 40, 53
- Bertrand, Louis, 134
- Beslay, 77
- Béziers section, 112
- Birmingham, 125
- Bise, Placide, 12
- Bismarck, Otto von, 27–29, 69, 71, 75,
141
- Blanqui, Auguste, 2, 10, 17, 35, 64, 75,
76
- Blanquists, ix, 7, 10, 17, 19, 44, 58, 76,
86, 90, 91, 112, 122, 124, 127, 130,
133, 134, 139
- Bobczynski, Konstanty, 15, 16
- Bohemia, 116; IWMA in, 117–18
- Bologna: Fascio Operaio, 104; Italian
federation congress (1873), 139
- Bolte, Friedrich, 119, 134, 141
- Bonaparte, Napoleon, 51, 70, 71
- Boon, Martin James, 42, 73, 87, 126
- Bordeaux section, 130
- Borkheim, Sigismund, 67, 68, 99
- Boruttau, Carl, 43, 72
- Boston section, 120
- Bourbon rule in Spain, end of, 105
- Bourdon, Antoine, 9, 25
- Bousquet, Abel, 112
- Bracke, 43, 64
- Bremer, 43
- Breslau “section,” 130
- Bright, John, 3
- Brismée, Désiré, 12, 27, 36, 48, 60, 112,
131–33
- Britain, 4, 7, 10, 12, 16, 51, 139;
contraction of IWMA in, 20–23;
federal council for, 87–88; *see also*
England, London
- British federation: congress [London
(1873), 140, 142; Nottingham (1872),
125–26]; and IWMA, 139–40; split in,
139–40
- Brix, 118
- Brosset, François, 50, 54
- Brousse, Paul, 143
- Bruhin, Casper Aloys, 49, 50, 60
- Brussels, 12, 13, 15, 25, 27, 47, 53, 138;
Belgian federation congress [1871,
113; 1872, 114, 138]; federalist
congress (1874), 143; French section,
113; section, 26 [foundation of, 13];
Third IWMA congress (1868), 35–41,
53, 142, 142
- Budapest, General Workers' Association,
117
- Buechner, Ludwig, 35
- Buerkli, Karl, 60

- Buetter, 36
Bulletin de la Fédération Jurassienne, 99
 Bund der Kommunisten, 6
 Burckhard, Theodor, 142
 Buttery, 87
- Cabetists, 120
 Cafiero, Carlo, 102, 131, 132, 137
 Camélinat, Zephirin, 9, 77
 Cameron, Andrew C., 60, 63, 119
 Camet, 137
 Caporusso, Stefano, 60, 101, 102
 Carl, 134, 141
 Carter, James, 16, 19, 21, 32
 Catalan, Adolphe, 36
 Catalonia, federal center of workers' associations, 106
Catechism of the Revolutionary, 58
 Central Committee (London), 2, 3, 5, 9, 13, 16, 121, 122
 Central Council (London), *passim*
 Chalain, 69, 77, 94, 95
 Champseix, Léonie ("André Léo"), 96
 Chartism, ix, 3, 4, 41–42
 Chaux-de-Fonds section, foundation of, 12
 Chemalé, 9, 17, 23, 33, 35, 61: memorial of to Geneva congress, 17
 Chicago, German sections, 120
 children, employment of, 18
 Christian Socialism, 3, 5
 Cincinnati, U.S. IWMA congress (1870), 63
 Circolo Operaio di Emanzipazione del Proletario, Milan, 103
Civil War in France, The: Address of the General Council of the International Working Men's Association, 83–84
 Claflin, Tennessee, 121
 Claris, Aristide, 96, 97, 99
 Clark, G.B., 126
 classes, abolition of, 19, 90–91, 99
 Cluseret, Gustave Paul, 77, 119, 143
 Coenen, 89, 131
 Cohn, 36, 89
 Colins, Jean Hippolyte De, 40, 48
 collective labor and mechanization, 39
 collectivism, 45; revolutionary, 49; victory of at Basel congress, 63
 collectivist principle, triumph of, 39–40
 Combault, 44
 Comité fédéral Romand, 91
 Communard refugees: in Belgium, 113; in London, 85; in Switzerland, 96–97
 Commune of Paris, *see* Paris Commune
 Communism, 13, 33, 39, 40, 43–45, 53, 61, 63, 100, 110, 139; collectivist-, 62; German, 137; and Paris Commune, 84
 Communist League, 61
Communist Manifesto, 14, 43, 57, 84, 107
 Comte, Auguste, 5, 13, 23, 48
 constitution, Swiss, 100
 cooperatives, workers', 8
 Copenhagen section, 118
 Cordoba, Spanish federation congress (1872–73), 137, 142
 Corps Législatif, 8
 Costa, 137
 Coudroy, 47
 Coullery, Pierre, 11, 12, 18, 19, 33–36, 38, 40, 67, 80, 99, 100
 Coulon, 39
Courier Français, 24
 Courmet, 123, 130, 133
 Cremer, William Randall, 3, 16, 19, 20
 Cuno, Theodor, 102, 103, 114, 116, 129, 130, 134, 135
 Cyrille, Victor, 130, 135
 Czartoryski, Prince, 8
- d'Aurelle de Paladines, General, 75
 Danielson, Nikolai, 128, 129
Das Kapital, 27, 29, 40, 49, 87, 120, 129, 135
 Dave, Victor, 131, 134, 135
 David, 134, 141
 De Colins, Jean Hippolyte, 12, 13, 39
 De Kayser, Napoléon, 13
 De Paepe, César, 12, 13, 15, 16, 32–40, 48, 49, 60–63, 89, 90, 93, 94, 131, 138
 De Potter, 39
 de Willebrord, Glaser, 129
 Debout, Paul, 12
 Delahaye, 86, 90, 92
 Dell, 15

- Democratic Association, 131; in Belgium, 12
Demokratisches Wochenblatt, 29
 Denmark, 118; IWMA in, 118
 Dentraygues, Émile ("Swarm"), 112, 130, 138
Der Arbeiter, 49
 Der Deutsche Arbeiterbildungsverein, 6
Der Kemokrat, 49
Der Neue Social-Demokrat, 140
Der Social-Demokrat, 28
Der Vorbote: Politische und Socialoekonomische Zeitschrift, 11, 26, 29, 44, 73, 117
 Dereure, 131, 134–36, 141
Die Arbeiter-Union, 120
 Dietzgen, Josef, 130
 Dimitrieva-Tomanovskaya, 99
 Dresden: revolution, 51; Social Democrat congress (1871), 115
 Druitt, 25
 "Dumont" (Eugene Louis Faillet), 130
 Duplex, John Baptiste, 11, 15, 36
 Dupont, 15, 16, 23, 32, 34, 36, 52, 89, 122, 123, 125–27, 130, 133, 135, 136, 139, 140
 Duval, 54, 131, 135, 136
 Eberhardt, 131
 Eccarius, Johann George, 6, 15, 16, 20, 22, 29, 32–36, 39, 40, 42, 55, 60, 62, 85, 87–89, 91, 107, 119, 121, 123–27, 130, 134, 139, 141, 143
 education, reform of, 38, 60
 Eichhoff, Wilhelm, 43
 Eisenach, VDAV congress (1869), 42–44, 57, 60, 68, 117
 Eisenachers, 115, 116
El Obrero, 106
 Elastic Webb-Weavers Society, 22
 electoral franchise movement, 5
Emancipación, 109, 110, 111
 Engels, Friedrich, xi, 1, 6, 14, 22, 29, 35, 40, 44, 51, 57, 72, 82, 85–89, 91, 93, 94, 98, 102–6, 108–13, 116, 118, 121–25, 127, 129, 130, 133–35, 139, 140, 141, 143
 England, 7, 10, 12, 16, 66, 96, 140; federal council for, 93; growth of IWMA in, 14–16; *see also* Britain, London
 English Positivists, 5
 Faillet, Eugene Louis ("Dumont"), 130
 Fanelli, Giuseppe (Joseph), 57, 101, 105, 106, 137
 "Farga, Pablo" (Paul Lafargue), 110
 Farga-Pellicer, 57, 60, 106, 107, 111, 131, 135, 137
 Farkas, Károly, 117, 130
 Favre, Jules, 84, 85
 Federal Committee, 90
 Federal Council, 90, 122
 federalist congress, Brussels (1874), 143
 Fédération Jurassienne, *see* Jura federation
 Fédération Romande, 50, 57, 64–67, 96, 97, 131; congress [(1870), 67; Vevey (1872), 101]
 Fenians, 120
 Florence, Società Democratica Internazionale, 103
 Fluse, 89, 131
 Fontaine, André, 13, 26, 27, 36, 37
 Fornaccieri, 134, 141
 Fourier, Charles, 105
 Fourierists, 120
 Fox, Peter André, 5, 15, 20, 21, 35, 41
 França, 111, 112
 France, 7, 10, 12, 16, 32, 69, 70, 72, 77, 96, 105; contraction of IWMA in, 23–26; IWMA in, 44–46, 139 [after Paris Commune, 112–13]; philosophical background of founding of IWMA, 8
 Franco-Prussian war, 69–73, 116, 118, 132
 Francs Ouvriers (Verviers), 26, 47
 Frank, 75
 Frankel, Léo, 46, 77, 82, 83, 86, 89, 91, 94, 99, 117, 123, 126, 127, 130, 133, 134, 136
 French branch, IWMA (London), 5, 15, 73, 86
 French Tendency, 143

- French, role of in founding of IWMA, 7–10
- Frey, Joseph Heinrich, 49
- Fribourg, Ernst, 1, 8, 9, 15, 19, 25, 64
- Friedlander, Hugo, 130
- Friscia, Saviero, 36, 101
- Fuveau, 24; section, foundation of, 24
- Gaglia, 26
- Galicia, 116
- Gambuzzi, Carlo, 57, 101
- Gandolfim, Mauro, 103
- Garibaldi, G., 52, 102
- Gazette de Lausanne*, 32
- Gazzettino Rosa*, 102, 103
- General Council: London, *passim*; New York, 134–44; move to New York, 133; and Paris Commune, 82–86
- General German Workers League (Allgemeiner Deutscher Arbeiterverein, ADAV), 27, 28, 43
- Geneva, 1, 12, 15, 25, 55; Alliance, 84; congress (1866), 16–20, 31, 34; First IWMA congress (1873), 142–43; French section, 97; Jura federation congress (1873), 143; Peace and Freedom congress, (1867), 31, 34–36, 52; role of in founding of IWMA, 10–11; section, 26 [for propaganda and revolutionary action, 125]; sections, 52–53, 56, 57, 59, 67, 101; sections, foundation of, 11
- Gerhard, Hendrik, 118, 131, 138
- German federation congress (1872), 88, 140
- German society in IWMA, in England, 15
- German Tendency, 143
- German Workers Educational Association [Der Deutsche Arbeiterbildungsverein], 6
- German section in France, 46
- Germans, role of in founding of IWMA, 6
- Germany, 17, 42, 43, 69, 70, 72, 103; IWMA in, 27–30, 115–16, 140–41; labor movement in, 115
- Gignoux, 54
- Gladstone, 42
- Glasgow, 125
- Gotha congress (1875), 141
- Gottraux, Jules, 25
- Guadeloupe, 23; section, 24
- Guesde, Jules, 96
- Guile, D., 24
- Guillaume, James, x, 6, 12, 36, 45, 60, 62, 64, 65, 67, 77, 80, 97, 99, 101, 103, 106, 129, 130–32, 134–37; expulsion of from IWMA, 135–36; vs. Marx, 99
- Hales, John, 22, 84, 87–89, 91, 121–27, 130, 134, 139, 140, 142, 143
- Hamburg Lassallian congress (1868), 30
- Harcourt, W. E., 131
- Harris, George, 42, 73
- Harrison, Frederick, 5, 84
- Hartwell, Robert, 3
- “Heim, Ludwig” (Heinrich Oberwinder), 130
- Héligon, 9
- Heng, 60, 64
- Hepner, Adolf, 99, 116, 129, 130
- Herman, 89, 91, 131
- Herzen, Alexander, 39, 51, 65
- Hess, Moses, 6, 28, 36, 37, 50, 60, 62, 99, 117
- Hins, 27, 36, 45, 48, 60, 89, 113, 114, 131
- Holland, 118, 138; and IWMA, 118, 138–39
- Howell, George, 3, 15, 22
- Hugenin, Fritz, 12
- Hungary, 116
- “Icarians,” 12, 63
- Industrial Newspaper Company, 22
- inheritance, 59; abolition of rights of, 57, 62–63; *see also* land, property
- International Alliance of Socialist Democracy, 98, 106
- International Federalist congress, Saint-Imier (1872), 137
- International Working Men’s Association [IWMA], *passim*; attitude of toward strikes, 37; Austria-Hungary, 116–17;

- and Bakunin, 51–68; in Belgium, 26–27, 44, 47–49; in Britain, 14–16; conference, London (1871), 88–94; congress, 53 [Basel (1869), 46, 50, 59–64, 101, 106, 117, 119; Brussels (1868), 35–41, 53, 105, 142; Geneva (1873), 142–43; Lausanne (1867), 24, 31–35, 52]; contraction of British membership in, 20–23; contraction of French membership in, 20–23; development in Switzerland, 26; dissolution of, 144; finances, 10, 15, 16, 21, 24–25, 41, 47, 54, 56, 104, 111, 118, 141; founding of, x, 1–19 [in Belgium, 10–14; Blanquist view of, 7; British view of, 7; Continental view of, 7; Marx's role in, 7, 21–22; philosophical background in France, 8; role of British in, 3–6; role of French in, 7–10; role of German contingent in, 6]; role of Polish question in, 2; role of trade unions in, 3–4; in Switzerland, 10–12; various claims for, 1–3]; in France, 44–46; French branch (London), 5, 15, 73, 86; French empire's repression of, 25; general congress, The Hague (1872), 112, 113, 116, 118, 124, 127–38, 140, 141; in Germany, 27–30; and L'Alliance internationale de la démocratie socialiste, 53–56; and League of Peace, 37; in London, 82–95; position of Marx in, 15; and Reform League, 21–23; in Rhineland, 29; statutes, 28, 52 [drafting of, 14–15]; in Switzerland, 49–50; and VDAV, 30
- Ireland, 22, 66, 86, 124; amnesty movement in, 42
- Irish question, 66, 124–25; and Marx, 66
- Ironfounders Society, 24
- Italian federation, 105; congress, Bologna (1873), 139
- Italy, 52, 112, 114; vs. General Council, 101; and IWMA, 101–5, 139
- Ivanov murder case, 58, 68, 92, 93
- IWMA, *see* International Working Men's Association
- Jaekch, Gustav, x
- Johannard, 77, 123, 127, 130, 134, 136
- Jones, Edward, 125, 140
- Jones, Ernest, 6
- Jung, Hermann, 11, 15–17, 24, 31, 36, 42, 50, 54, 55, 60, 62, 63, 66, 73, 86–89, 91, 101, 123, 125–27, 130, 139, 140, 142; vs. Marx, 127
- Jungnickel, 43
- Jura federation, 91, 92, 97, 101, 104, 110, 111, 113, 114, 122, 125, 129, 131, 137, 140; congress, 97, 98 [Geneva (1873), 143; Saint-Imier (1872), 137]; vs. General Council, 97–101; and IWMA, 137
- Jura mountains, foundation of IWMA in, 11–12
- Jura sections, 67, 91, 92, 94, 97; congress, Sonvillier, 97; foundation of, 11–12
- Kavanagh, 134
- Kilke, Charles W., 85
- Klein, 36
- Kugelmann, Ludwig, 22, 32, 130
- Ladendorf, 34
- Lafargue, Laura Marx, 23, 104, 110
- Lafargue, Paul, 23, 44, 46, 88, 105, 106, 110–12, 114, 131, 133, 136; "Pablo Farga," 110
- La Federación*, 107, 108, 110
- Lafrançais, Gustave, 96
- L'Alliance internationale de la démocratie socialiste, 53; and IMWA, 53–56; statutes, 54
- La Montagne*, 80
- land: collectivization, 33–34; property, ownership of, 60–62; reform, 38–39, 42, 51, 59, 121
- Langlois, 61
- Lankiewicz, 80
- La Petite Presse*, 75
- La Plebe*, 129
- La Révolution Sociale*, 97, 99
- La Solidarité*, 80
- Lassalle, Ferdinand, 27, 28, 35, 43, 44
- Lassalleian congress, Hamburg (1868), 30

- Lassalleans, 30, 43, 44, 70, 115, 119, 130, 140; critique of, by Marx, 28
- Latin rebellion, 96–114
- La Tribune du Peuple*, 12
- Laurel, 134
- Laurier, 46, 47
- Lausanne, 11, 26, 31, 36; Second IWMA congress (1867), 24, 31–35, 52; sections, 26 [foundation of, 11–12]
- La Voix de l'Avenir, Journal de l'Association Internationale des Travailleurs*, 12
- Lawrence, Matthew, 16, 21, 25
- League of Peace and Freedom, 35, 37, 40, 52, 53, 106; and IWMA, 37
- Ledru-Rollin, 6
- Leeds, 125
- Lefort, Henri, 1, 8, 9
- Lefrançais, Gustave, 137
- L'Égalité. Journal de l'Association internationale des travailleurs de la Suisse romande*, 55, 57, 64–67, 73, 80, 94, 101
- Legion Iberica de Trabajo, 36
- Legislative Corps, 45
- Lehning, Arthur, x, 52
- Leipzig congress (1863), 27
- Le Lubez, Victor, 1, 5, 13, 14, 20
- L'Emancipazione del Proletario, 104
- Le Moussu, 86, 123, 124, 130, 133
- Leno, John Bedford, 3
- "Léo, André" (Champseix, Léonie), 96
- Le Peuple*, 12, 13
- Les prétendus scissions dans l'Internationale*, 98–99
- Lessner, F., 26, 32, 35, 36, 39, 60, 61, 62, 130, 133, 139
- Levièle, 134, 141
- Lévy, Armand, 8
- Libero Pensiero*, 102, 103
- Liberté*, 26, 114
- liberties, political, question of, 34
- Liebers, Bruno, 118, 128
- Liebkecht, Wilhelm, 26, 28, 29, 42, 43, 60, 62, 64, 67, 68, 70–72, 91, 115–17, 140
- Liège, 26; section, 38
- Limousin, Charles, 9
- L'Internationale*, 73, 108, 114
- Lisbon section, 111
- Liverpool, 125
- Locle section, foundation of, 12
- loi Dufaure, 112
- London, 1–3, 8, 10, 11, 13–20, 25–27, 29, 31, 35, 40, 46, 51, 56, 59, 67, 82, 84, 86, 96, 101, 105, 112, 113, 141; Blanquists, 133; British federation congress (1873), 140, 142; Communal refugees in, 85; conference, 89, 97, 98, 109, 110, 114, 115–16, 120, 122, 123; congress (1865), 15–16; IWMA in, 82–95; Second IWMA conference (1871), 88–94; sections, 87; Trades Council (LTC), 2, 3, 6, 21, 22, 41; University, 5; *see also* England, Britain
- Longuet, Jean, 33–36, 77, 86, 88, 90, 123, 130, 133, 136
- Lopatin, Herman, 68
- Lorenzo, Anselmo, 89–92, 106, 109, 110, 111
- "Lucain" (Frédéric Potel), 130, 134, 135
- Lucraft, Benjamin, 3, 36, 59, 60, 61, 84, 85, 103
- Ludwig, Gustav, 130
- Lyon, 10, 24, 46; conference, 46; ovalistes, 60; section, 23, 24, 46 [foundation of, 10]
- Lyubavin, Nikolai, 129, 135
- MacDonnell, Patrick, J., 86–89, 91, 122–24, 130, 133, 135
- Machiavelli, Niccolò, 58
- Madrid, 107, 137; federation, 111; Nucleo provisional fundador de la Asociación Internacional, 106; section, 131
- "Magallan, Sarro" (Antonio y Anglosa), 36, 105
- Mainz, German federation congress (1872), 88, 140
- Malatesta, 137
- Malon, Benoît, 2, 9, 44, 45, 55, 74, 75, 77, 96, 99, 112
- Manchester: congress (1873), 140; section, 125

- Manifest der Kommunistischen Partei*, 6
- Manin, Daniele, 25
- Marseillaise*, 45
- Marseilles, 46; section, foundation of, 24
- Marsclan, 111, 131, 135, 137
- Martin, 86, 89, 90
- Marx, Karl, *passim*; and abstentionism, 91; and Bakunin, 65–66, 99–100, 108; critique of Lassaleans, 28; critique of Proudhon, 28, 37; economic theories of, 35; vs. Guillaume, 99; and Hales, 87–88, 125–26; and Irish question, 66; vs. Jung, 127; and Jura federation, 99; role of in founding of IWMA, 21–22; vs. Massini, 102–3; memorial of to Geneva congress, 17; opposition of to pacifism, 32; opposition of to Peace congress, 31–32; and Paris Commune, 83–85; position of in IWMA, 15; and Robin, 88, 91–92; role of in drafting IWMA statutes, 14–15; standing of in Germany, 29; and war, 69–71
- Marx, Laura, *see* Lafargue, Laura
- Mazzini, Giuseppe, 2, 6, 7, 52, 85, 102, 103; vs. Marx, 102–3
- Mazzinian Republicanism, 52
- Mazzinists, 7, 51, 52
- mechanization, effects of, 37
- Mehring, x
- Meneses, Antonio, 106
- Meron, Constant, 12
- Mesa, José, 109, 110, 111, 137
- Metz, surrender of, 74
- Mexico, 25
- Meyer, Siegfried, 119
- Milan, Circolo Operaio di Emancipazione del Proletario, 103
- Milke, 130
- Mill, John Stuart, 3, 31, 108
- Milner, George, 42, 59, 73, 90, 126, 139
- monetary reform, *see* bank reform
- Monier, Marc, 11
- Mora, Angel, 106
- Mora, Francisco, 104, 106, 109–11
- Morago, Tomás, 106, 109–11, 131, 135, 137
- Moravia, 117; IWMA in, 117–18
- Mottershead, Thomas, 42, 87–89, 118, 123, 124, 130, 134, 139
- Murat, 36, 39, 44, 45, 77
- Murphy, 86
- Murray, Charles, 42, 139
- mutual credit, 60
- mutuellistes, French, 62
- Nabruzzi, 137
- Naples: central section, 101; mechanics section, 60, 101
- Narodnoye Delo* [*The People's Cause*], 67
- National Labor Union (U.S.A.), 60, 119
- National Labour Union, 63
- National League for the Independence of Poland, 3
- National Reform League, 41
- Nechaev, Sergei, 57–59, 64, 67, 68, 92, 93, 98, 129; affair, 92–93
- neo-Jacobins, 76, 77
- Nettlau, Max, x, 56, 57, 101, 106, 107, 114, 130
- Neuchâtel, congress, 26, 105
- Neumayer, Ludwig, 60, 117
- New Orleans section, 120
- New York, 141; Council, and IWMA, 141–42; Czech section, 118, 120; French section, 119; General Council (1874), 138, 139, 141, 143–44; German section, 119–20; Irish section, 120; Local No. 5, 119; section, 130 [No. 1, 119; No. 12, 121–22]
- North German federation, 69
- Nottingham: First British federation congress (1872), 125–26; International Labour Protection League, 125
- Nucleo provisional fundador de la Asociación Internacional, 106
- Nuremberg VDAV congress (1868), 29–30, 44
- Oberwinder, Heinrich (“Ludwig Heim”), 60, 117, 130, 142
- O’Brien, Bronterre, 42
- O’Brienites, 41, 42, 59, 87, 121, 122, 123, 124

- Odger, George, 2, 3, 4, 15, 16, 18, 20, 21, 22, 42, 84, 103
 Ogariov, N., 80
O Pensamento Social, 111
 Oretti, 111
 Owen, Robert, 124
 Owenite Socialism, 3
 Owenites, 86
 Ozerov, 80, 81
- Palix, 46, 64
 Palmerston, Lord, 5
 Paris, 1, 10, 13, 15, 16, 18, 24, 27, 82, 83; Commune, 64, 76–81, 96, 108, 112–14, 117, 118, 120, 132 [Communism, 84; effect of, on Denmark, 118; effect of, on Germany, 115; effect of, on Hungary, 117; effect of, on IWMA, 79–81; and London General Council, 82–86; effect of, on Spain, 108–9; and Marx, 83–85]; congress, 63; Ferré section, 112; German section, 117; section 25–26, 46 [foundation of, 7–10]
 Peace and Freedom congress: Bern (1868), 37, 40, 53; Geneva (1867), 31, 34–36, 52
 Pellicer Farga, Rafael, 57, 60, 106, 111
 Perret, Henri, 50, 89, 90, 91, 99, 100, 142, 143
 Perron, 54, 81
 Phil, Theodor Sophus, 118, 131, 135
 Philadelphia section, 120–21
 Pi y Margall, 138
 Pindy, 137
 Pio, Louis, 118
 Poland, 2, 3, 17, 18, 141, 142
 Polish question, 8, 16–19, 22, 51; role of in founding of IWMA, 2–3, 8
 Polish society in IWMA, in England, 15
 Polish uprising, 51
 political abstentionism, 34
 political liberties, question of, 34
Political Theology of Mazzini and the International, The, 103
 Portugal, 109; IWMA in, 111–12
 Positivists, 5, 39
 Postgate, R.W., x
 Potel, Frédéric ("Lucain"), 130
 Potter, George, 22
 Prague revolution, 51
Progrès, 64, 65, 67, 92
proletarian class consciousness, 7
Proletario, 104
 property, 49; question of, 33–34, 38; *see also* land
 Proudhon, Pierre-Joseph, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 17, 35, 37, 48, 51, 52, 71, 105, 108; Marx's critique of, 28
 Proudhonists, 11, 18, 19, 32, 35, 37, 38, 44, 53, 58, 64, 77, 86, 114, 120; "Proudhonies enragés," 45
 Prussia, 29, 71
 Pyat, 73, 77, 82
- Ranvier, 130
 Reform Act (1867), 23
 Reform League, 2, 3, 5, 15, 21–23, 36, 42
 religion, attitude toward, 16, 32, 66, 84
 Remy, 99
 revolutionary anarchism, 52
Reynolds Newspaper, 42
 Rhineland, growth of IWMA in, 29
 Rhône federation, 64
 Riasanov, D., x
 Richard, Albert, 37, 46, 64, 80
 Rimini conference of Italian federation (1872), 105, 129
 Roach, 87, 130, 134
 Robin, Paul, 47, 60, 64, 65, 86, 88, 90, 91, 92, 94, 95, 106
 Rochart, 86, 89, 90
 Rochefort, Henri, 45
Roma del Popolo, 102, 103
 Romagna congress (1872), 104
 Romand Federal Committee, 92, 97
 Rome, 25
 Rossa, O'Donovan, 120
 Rotterdam section, 138
 Rouen, 10, 23, 46
 Rougerie, 47
 Rude, F., 58
 Ruehl, 125
 Russia, 4, 17, 18, 40, 58, 90, 92
 Russian question, 92–93
 Russian section (Geneva), 67

- Saint-Clair, 134, 141
 San Francisco section, 120
 Saragossa, Spanish federation congress (1872), 107, 110–11
 Sauva, 131, 135, 136
 Schepler, 36
 Scheu, Andreas, 117
 Scheu, Heinrich, 130
 Schulze-Delitzsch, Hermann, 35
 Schumacher, 130
 Schweitzer, Johann Baptist von, 28, 29, 43
 Schwitzguébel, Adhemar, 12, 57, 60, 64, 67, 91, 97, 101, 131, 135–137, 140
 Scotland, 22
 Second Empire, end of, 72
 Sedan, battle of, 72, 73
 Sektionsgruppe der deutschen Sprache, 11
 Sentiñon, Gaspard, 57, 60, 64, 106, 110
 Serrailier, Auguste, 41, 73, 77, 82, 87, 88, 89, 91, 92, 112, 113, 122, 123, 124, 125, 127, 130, 133, 135, 136, 141, 142
 Sexton, 124, 130, 133
 Shaw, Robert, 20, 36, 41
 Sheffield Trade Union conference, 21
 Slavs, 103
 Smith, Godwin, 3
 Social Democrat congress, Dresden (1871), 115
Socialisten, 118
 societies, affiliation of to IWMA, 21
Solidarité, 67, 92
 Sonvillier, Jura sections congress, 97
 Sorge, Friedrich Adolphe, 96, 119, 120, 122, 129, 131, 132, 134, 136, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144
 Spain, 105, 106, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 138; effects of Paris Commune, 108–9; IWMA in, 105–11, 137–38
 Spanish federation: congress [Cordoba (1872–73), 137, 142; Saragossa (1872), 107, 110–11]; foundation of, 107
 Speyer, 134
 Spillingard, 131, 134, 135, 136
 Spoetler, 75
 Stampa, 11, 34
 Stanley, Lord, 25
 Starke, 49
 statutes: IWMA, of, drafting of, 14–15; L'Alliance internationale de la démocratie socialiste, 54; Marx's, 28
 Steens, 89
 Steklov, G.M., x
 St. Imier: International Federalist congress (1872), 137; Jura federation congress (1872), 137, 139
 St. Louis section, 120
 Stepney, Cowell, 36, 41, 55, 60, 71, 86, 130
 strike: action, principle of, 17; Belgian tailors', 27; breaking, battle against, 4, 7; Dampremy miners', 27; French textile, 46; Fuveau miners', 24; Geneva building workers', 26; London builders', 4; London tailors' and hairdressers', 21; Lyon ovalistes, of, 46; Paris bronze workers', 24; Paris tailors', 24–25; problem, Marx's treatment of, 17; Saint Etienne miners', 46; Seraing metal workers', 48; against war, 40; Warwickshire agricultural workers', 126
 strikes, 34; IWMA attitude toward, 26, 37; suppression of by military, 69–70; in Switzerland, 50; use of by French workers, 24
 Stumpf, 34
 "Swarm" (Émile Dentraygues), 130, 135, 136, 138, 139
 Swiss constitution, 100
 Swiss question, 97
 Swiss sections, 50
 Switzerland, 10, 12, 17, 23, 49, 50, 59, 67, 85, 90, 91, 96, 99; Communard refugees in, 85, 96–97; conflict in, 90–92; development of IWMA in, 26; foundation of IWMA in, 10; IWMA in, 49–50
 Tailor's Society, 25
 Taylor, P.A., 85, 87
 Tedeschi, 111

- Termes, Josep, 107
 Terzaghi, Carlo, 104
 Teulière, 99
The Commonwealth, 22, 23
 The Hague: IWMA General congress
 (1872), 112, 113, 116, 118, 124, 127–
 38, 140, 141 [opposition to, 137–44];
 section, 118, 138
The Irishman, 86
 The Land Assembly of the Social
 Democratic Party, 70
The World, 141
 Theisz, 77, 86, 90, 94, 95
 Thiers, August, 75, 79
 Tibaldi, 85
 Tito, 111
 Tolain, Henri Louis, 7, 8, 9, 10, 15, 16,
 18, 19, 24, 25, 33, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39,
 61, 74
 Tomàs, Francisco, 106, 110, 111
 Townsend, William, 42, 127
 trade unionism, 60, 63
 trade unions: Marx's treatment of, 17;
 role of in founding of IWMA, 3–4
Travail, Le, 45
Tribune du Peuple, 25
 Trochu, General, 74
 Tsarist Russia, 2, 8
 Turin, 104; L'Emancipazione del
 Proletario, 104
 Turkey, 34

 U.S. IWMA congress, Cincinnati (1870),
 63
 United States, 4, 21, 119; IWMA in, 119–
 22
 "Universal Revolutionary League," 58
 Utin, Nikolai, 66, 67, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93,
 94, 99, 100, 114
 Utrecht section, 118, 138

 Vahlteich, Julius, 29
 Vaillant, 86, 90, 91, 123, 129, 130, 133,
 134
 Valencia: federal council, 111; Spanish
 federation conference (1871), 109
 Van Den Abele, 131, 142, 143
 Van Der Hout, 131, 136

 Van Heddeghem ("Walter"), 130, 134,
 135, 138, 139
 Varlin, Eugène, 9, 15, 24, 25, 26, 36, 44,
 45, 46, 49, 55, 61, 62, 63, 64, 69, 74,
 76, 77, 79, 83, 86, 89
 VDAV, *see* Association of German
 Workers Societies
 Vermorel, 24
 Verrycken, 89, 91
 Verviers, 26, 27
 Vésinier, Pierre, 1, 16, 27, 54, 77
 Vevey: Fédération Romande congress
 (1872), 101; sections, 67
 Vichard, Paul, 130, 134, 135
 Vienna section, 117
 Vinas, "Gomez," 143
 Vogt, August, 119
 Vogt, Gustaw, 53
Voix du Peuple, 45
Volksfreund, 43, 72
Volksstaat, 67, 70, 73, 116, 130
 Volksverband (Antwerp), 26
 Vuilleumier, Marc, 19, 96

 "Walter" (Van Heddeghem), 130, 134,
 135, 138, 139
 war: elimination of, 35, 37; Franco-
 Prussian, *see* Franco-Prussian war
 Ward, 134, 141
 Washington section, 120–21
 Weber, Wilhelm, 6
 West, William, 131, 132
 Weston, John, 3, 14, 15, 139
 Wheeler, 16
 Wiener-Neustadt section, 117
 Willebrord, Glaser de, 113, 114
 Wilmart, Raimond ("Wilmor"), 130, 136
 Wolff, Luigi, 6, 14, 85
 women: emancipation of, 131;
 employment of, 18
Woodhall and Clafin's Weekly, 121, 122
 Woodhall, Victoria, 121
 Woodhall-Clafin faction, 122
 workers' congress, Barcelona [(1868),
 105; (1870), 106–8]
 Workers' Educational Association,
 Nuremberg, 36
 workers' state, economic, 108

working class: definition, ix-x; economic emancipation of, 94; liberation of, x, 4, 19, 32-33, 34; organization of, 45; politicization of, ix

Working Men's Garibaldi Committee, 3

Working Men's Suffrage and Ballot Association, 2

Workman's Advocate, 22, 60

Wróblewski, Walery, 86, 87, 126, 130, 133, 135, 136, 142

Zabicki, Antoni, 23, 87

Zamoyski, Count, 16

Zhukovski, 66, 81, 92, 97, 101, 129, 131, 132, 135

Zurich center, 98

About the Author

HENRYK KATZ died in June 1990, just after he had completed this book. Born in May 1914 of a Jewish family in Lvov (then part of Austria, later to become part of Poland), he attended Lvov University and graduated in 1937 from the Academy of Foreign Trade. As war clouds were gathering in Europe, he spent a year's study in Paris and London, beginning a lifelong association with Britain. The invasion of Poland prevented him from returning home, making him an exile in an allied country. He took various jobs, registered externally with the University of London in Economic History, and enlisted in the British Army in 1943. Nearly all his family perished in the Holocaust, although one sister survived.

After the war, he returned to Poland, and in 1949 he took up a post in the University of Lodz. He took a doctorate there in 1951 and was appointed Professor of Modern History in 1964. He taught mainly in European and American History and published works on the First International, the Reform League, and a book entitled *England on the Threshold of Democracy*. During this time, he spent a year studying in Britain. After returning to Poland, he had a difficult time, as anti-Semites and reactionaries held sway, and he was outspoken in his criticism of them at the university. Eventually, he had to resign his chair, and there followed a lean period until 1972 when the Katz family arrived in Britain. He obtained a visiting professorship at the University of Nottingham, then obtained the post of Principal Lecturer in History at Coventry Polytechnic, which he held until his retirement in 1979. During this time he became International Secretary for the Labour History Society. He remained active in retirement, as a part-time lecturer at the Polytechnic and at the Universities of Warwick and Nottingham, and also writing the remainder of this book, the text of which he had completed before his death.

Oliver Furley, with the assistance of John Halstead and Anne Godrich, provided the information for this biography.